

Annex

# Official Journal

of the

## European Communities

No 1-259

English edition

### Debates of the European Parliament

---

1980-1981 Session  
Report of Proceedings  
from 7 to 11 July 1980  
Europe House, Strasbourg

Contents

<b>Monday, 7 July 1980</b>	1
Resumption of session, p. 2 — Membership of Parliament — Credentials, p. 2 — Committees, p. 2 — Petitions, p. 2 — Documents, p. 2 — Texts of treaties, p. 2 — Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution, p. 2 — Urgent procedure, p. 2 — Order of business, p. 3 — Speaking time, p. 7 — Tabling of amendments, p. 7 — Procedure without report, p. 8 — Electronic vote, p. 8 — Urgent procedure, p. 8 — Action taken on Parliament's opinions, p. 9 — Question-time, p. 11 — Air-traffic control, p. 25 — Next sitting, p. 28 — Annex, p. 28	
<b>Tuesday, 8 July 1980</b>	38
Minutes, p. 40 — Committees, p. 40 — Statement, p. 40 — Urgent procedure, p. 40 — Parliament's first anniversary, p. 41 — Tabling of motions to reject the budget, p. 43 — Luxembourg presidency, p. 43 — Urgent procedure, p. 73 — Agenda, p. 73 — Luxembourg presidency (contd), p. 73 — Rules of Procedure, p. 78 — Urgent procedure, p. 92 — Question time, p. 93 — Next sitting, p. 106 — Annex, p. 107	
<b>Wednesday, 9 July 1980</b>	113
Minutes, p. 114 — Documents, p. 114 — Membership of Parliament, p. 114 — Urgent procedure, p. 114 — Motions to reject the budget, p. 117 — Agenda, p. 123 — Economic development, p. 123 — Urgent procedure, p. 146 — Voting time, p. 147 — Urgent procedure, p. 164 — Next sitting, p. 164 — Annex, p. 165	
<b>Thursday, 10 July 1980</b>	212
Minutes, p. 213 — Documents, p. 213 — Committees, p. 213 — Urgent procedure, p. 214 — Agenda, p. 220 — Preliminary draft budget for 1981, p. 221 — Air-traffic control (contd), p. 226 — Credentials, p. 237 — Urgent procedure, p. 237 — Voting time, p. 237 — Steel industry, p. 238 — Industrial products from third countries — Motor vehicles, etc. — Biodegradability — Powered industrial trucks, p. 267 — Integration of railway undertakings, p. 277 — Transport infra-	

(Continued overleaf)

NOTE TO READER

Appearing at the same time as the English edition are editions in the five other official languages of the Communities : Danish, German, French, Italian and Dutch. The English edition contains the original texts of the interventions in English and an English translation of those made in other languages. In these cases there are, after the name of the speaker, the following letters, in brackets, to indicate the language spoken : (DK) for Danish, (D) for German, (F) for French, (I) for Italian and (NL) for Dutch.

The original texts of these interventions appear in the edition published in the language spoken.

Contents (continued)

structure, p. 283 — Implementation of 1979 budget, p. 289 — Budgetary control of Data-Processing Centre, p. 295 — Refugees in Horn of Africa, p. 299 — Membership of Parliament, p. 304 — Next sitting, p. 304

Friday, 11 July 1980 . . . . . 305

Minutes, p. 307 — Documents, p. 307 — Texts of treaties, p. 307 — Petitions, p. 307 — Membership of Parliament, p. 307 — Committees, p. 307 — Procedure without report, p. 307 — Decision on early vote, p. 308 — Urgent procedure, p. 308 — Refugees in South China Sea — Kampuchea — Incident between Vietnamese and Thai troops, p. 308 — Human rights in Argentina, p. 315 — Fresh lemons, p. 316 — Fish stocks, p. 316 — Areas under vines, p. 320 — Voting time, p. 321 — Committees, p. 337 — Membership of Parliament, p. 337 — ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly, p. 337 — Next part-session, p. 337 — Minutes, p. 337 — Adjournment, p. 337



## SITTING OF MONDAY, 7 JULY 1980

1. Resumption of the session . . . . .	2	Mr Davignon; Mr Seal; Mr Davignon . . . . .	14
2. Membership of Parliament — Verification of credentials . . . . .	2	Procedural motion: Mr Spicer . . . . .	15
3. Membership of committees . . . . .	2	Mr Beazley; Mr Davignon; Mr Key; Mr Davignon; Mr Martin; Mr Pannella; Mr Davignon . . . . .	15
4. Petitions . . . . .	2	Procedural motions: Mr Hume; Mr Pannella . . . . .	16
5. Documents received . . . . .	2	Question No 5 by Mr Capanna: Use of the EEC appropriations for the earthquake area in Friuli, Italy:	
6. Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council . . . . .	2	Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Capanna; Mr Natali . . . . .	17
7. Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution . . . . .	2	Question No 6 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano: Meeting of the Council of Education Ministers:	
8. Urgent procedure . . . . .	2	Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission; Mrs Nielsen; Mr Jenkins; Mr Normanton; Mr Jenkins; Mr Megahy; Mr Jenkins; Mr Bøgh; Mr Jenkins; Mrs Viehoff; Mr Jenkins, Mr Van Aerssen; Mr Jenkins . . . . .	18
9. Order of business:		Question No 7 Mr Newton Dunn: Fishing: Mr Jenkins; Mr Newton Dunn; Mr Jenkins; Mrs Ewing; Mr Jenkins; Mr Spicer; Mr Jenkins; Mr Harris; Mr Jenkins . . . . .	20
Mr Pannella; Mr Blaney; Mr Fanti (COM); Mr D'Angelosante; Mr Pannella; Mr von der Vring; Mr Pannella; Mr Glinne . . . . .	3	Question No 8 by Mr Boyes: Spanish steel: Mr Davignon; Mr Boyes; Mr Davignon; Mr Bonde; Mr Davignon . . . . .	21
10. Speaking time . . . . .	7	Procedural motion: Mr Normanton . . . . .	22
11. Deadline for tabling amendments; Mr Pannella . . . . .	7	Question No 9 by Mr Patterson: Year of the disabled: Mr Vredeling; Mr Patterson; Mr Vredeling; Mr Enright; Mr Vredeling; Mr Hume; Mr Vredeling; Miss Brookes; Mr Vredeling; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Vredeling . . . . .	22
12. Procedure without report . . . . .	8	Question No 10 by Mr Romualdi: Attacks on Libyan refugees in Community countries: Mr Jenkins . . . . .	24
13. Electronic voting system . . . . .	8	Question No 11 by Mr Tyrrell: Exports of butter to Russia: Mr Jenkins; Mr Tyrrell; Mr Jenkins; Mr Hord; Mr Jenkins; Mr Seligman; Mr Jenkins; Mr Harris; Mr Jenkins; Mr Norman-ton . . . . .	24
14. Decision on urgency: Mr Hänsch; Mr Johnson; Mr Klepsch (EPP) . . . . .	8	18. Development of a coordinated air traffic control system — Report by Mr Janssen van Raay on behalf of the Committee on Transport (Doc. 1-274/80)	
15. Action taken on the opinions and proposals of Parliament		Procedural motion: Mr Pannella; Mr Moreland; Mr Moorhouse; Mr Seefeld; Mr Berkhouwer; Mr Janssen van Raay, rapporteur; Mr Cottrell; Mr Pannella; Mr Herman; Mr Cardia . . . . .	25
Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Kirk; Mr Adams; Mr Scott-Hopkins; Mr Natali; Mr Sherlock; Mr Natali; Mr Kirk; Mr Natali; Mr Patterson; Mr Kirk; Mr Natali, Mr Kirk; Mr Scott-Hopkins . . . . .	9	19. Agenda for next sitting . . . . .	27
16. Question time (Doc. 1-287/80):		Annex . . . . .	28
Questions to the Commission of the European Communities: . . . . .	11		
Question No 1 by Lord Douro: VAT on bloodstock: Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission; Lord Douro; Mr Tugendhat; Mr Turner; Mr Tugendhat . . . . .	11		
17. Question No 2 Mr Seligman: Arab Telecommunications Satellite Project (ARAB-SAT):			
Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mr Seligman; Mr Davignon . . . . .	12		
Question No 3 by Mrs Ewing: Forecasting and assessment in the field of science and technology (FAST): Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission; Mrs Ewing; Mr Vredeling; Sir Peter Vaneck; Mr Vredeling; Mr Hutton; Mr Vredeling; Mr Seligman; Mr Vredeling; Mr Seal; Mr Vredeling . . . . .	13		
Question No 4 by Mr Seal: The EEC textile industry:			

IN THE CHAIR: Mrs VEIL

*President*

*(The sitting was opened at 5 p.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is open

#### 1. *Resumption of the session*

**President.** — I declare resumed the session of the European Parliament adjourned on 27 June 1980.

#### 2. *Membership of Parliament — Verification of credentials*

**President.** — The French authorities have informed me of the appointment on 1 July 1980 of Mr Doublet as a Member of the European Parliament to replace Mr Messmer.

I welcome our new colleague and remind the House that, pursuant to Rule 3(3) of the Rules of Procedure, a Member whose credentials have not yet been verified takes his seat provisionally in Parliament and on its committees with the same right as other Members.

At its meeting of 7 July 1980 the Bureau verified the credentials of Mr Vitale and Mr Fanton whose appointments have already been announced.

Pursuant to Rule 3(1) of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau has established that these appointments comply with the provisions of the Treaties.

It therefore asks the House to ratify these appointments.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

#### 3. *Membership of committees*

**President.** — I have received from the Communist and Allies Group a request for the appointment of Mr Vitale to the Committee on Agriculture, to replace Mr Papapietro.

Are there any objections?

The appointment is ratified.

#### 4. *Petitions*

**President.** — I have received ten petitions whose titles, together with the names of their authors, are set out in the minutes of this sitting.

These petitions have been entered under Nos. 34/80 to 43/80 in the General Register provided for in Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedure and have been referred to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

The minutes also contain various decisions concerning these petitions.

#### 5. *Documents received*

**President.** — Since the session was adjourned I have received from the Council, the Commission, the parliamentary committees and Members, various documents which are listed in the minutes of this sitting.

#### 6. *Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council*

**President.** — I have received from the Council certified true copies of various agreements and acts. These documents, which are listed in the minutes of this sitting, will be deposited in the archives of the European Parliament.

#### 7. *Withdrawal of a motion for a resolution*

**President.** — Mr Pisani has informed me that he has withdrawn the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-800/79) which he and other colleagues had tabled on a new common agricultural policy.

#### 8. *Urgent procedure*

**President.** — I have received from the Council a request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure in respect of a proposal for a regulation on the contribution of the United Kingdom to the general budget and of a proposal for a regulation concerning the financial mechanisms (Doc. 1-273/80).

The request is supported by the fact that the Council is due to discuss these proposals at its meeting on 22 July 1980.

**President**

I have also received from Mr Schieler and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Wawrzik and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group) and Mrs Agnelli and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, a motion for a resolution with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on aid to refugees in the South China Sea (Doc. 1-284/80).

The reasons supporting this request are contained in the document itself.

I shall put these requests to the vote at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

**9. Order of business**

**President.** — The next item is the order of business.

At its meeting of 19 June 1980 the enlarged Bureau drew up the draft agenda (PE 66.047/rev.), which has been distributed.

Having noted the various problems relating to the present part-session, the enlarged Bureau decided at its meeting this morning to propose the following changes in the agenda.

The deadline for tabling proposals for outright rejection of the new draft general budget of the European Communities for the 1980 financial year has been fixed at 10 a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday, 8 July.

The enlarged Bureau wishes to remind the House in this connection that requests to amend the proposals for outright rejection cannot be submitted in the form of amendments to these proposals and that they should take the form of a proposal for outright rejection.

Statements on the proposal for outright rejection will be made at 9 a.m. on Wednesday, 9 July and the vote will be taken at 3 p.m. on the same day.

Speaking Time for these statements has been allocated as follows:

- three minutes for the authors of the proposals (one author for each proposal)
- five minutes for each political group
- a total of five minutes for non-attached Members.

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Madam President, on which Rule did you base that decision: on Rule 28 or on some other provision of the Rules of Procedure?

**President.** — On the basis of Rule 28. As this case is not provided for in the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau decided to make this proposal to Parliament which may, of course, reject it.

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Madam President, if I have understood correctly, these documents are to be tabled on Tuesday, discussed at 9 a.m. on Wednesday and the vote then taken at 3 p.m. on the same day.

Since the length of speeches for items placed on the agenda for Tuesday and Wednesday is governed by Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure, I would draw your attention to the superfluous nature of your announcement and to the infringement of the Rules of Procedure which you are condoning.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, your statement has been noted. However, I should like to point out, that your group, which was represented at this morning's meeting, did not comment on the proposal.

Are there any further remarks?

That is agreed.

Secondly, at the request of the Committee on Transport, the enlarged Bureau proposes that the vote on Mr Janssen van Raay's report on aerial navigation (Doc. 1-274/80) be taken this evening. It would therefore be the last item on the agenda. If the vote cannot be taken this evening it will be taken at the normal time, i.e. during voting time on Wednesday.

Are there any remarks?

That is agreed.

Thirdly, the enlarged Bureau proposes that the debate on the Luster report (Doc. 1-448/80/corr.) on the amendments to the Rules of Procedure, scheduled for Wednesday, be placed on Tuesday's agenda after the statement by the Council.

I remind the House that the rapporteur already introduced his report in May and that the speaking time proposed for Tuesday's sitting should be divided by those concerned between the debate on the Council's statement and the debate on the Luster report since, as Mr Pannella has just pointed out, speaking time for Tuesday is governed by Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure.

I have received from Mr Blaney, Mr Pannella and Mr Bonde, on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members, a proposal pursuant to Rule 12 (2) of the Rules of Procedure, to amend the agenda, by

**President**

deleting the debate on the Luster report scheduled for Wednesday or, if this proposal is rejected, not to apply Rule 28 to the debate on the Luster report.

I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — Madam President, my amendment consists of two proposals, the second of which depends on the outcome of the first. The first proposal is that the Luster report should be withdrawn. The reason why I feel this should be done is that we in the Technical Coordination Group and indeed many others over the last 12 months have been of the opinion, and indeed have said so time and again, that the Rules require a general rather than a piecemeal revision. This is in fact the third or fourth time that a great deal of our time has been taken up with this sort of piecemeal discussion. The present report is, if anything, less progressive than those that went before it and the 171 amendments from all parts of the House provide a clear indication of the general attitude of the House to that particular document. Furthermore, the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions has already embarked upon an overall revision. Consequently, there is little point in our tackling a series of minor points, if we only have to revise our decisions in the light of that Committee's proposals at a later date. If the House agrees that this item should be deleted then we shall be delighted. Strict application of Rule 28 as regards Wednesday's agenda would, indeed, be carrying things too far since the very size of the agenda, with the important programme speech of the President of the Council and the Luster report, would mean that the smaller groups would be obliged to devote what little speaking time they have to one single item. I feel that the bigger groups should not have it all their own way and that the backbenchers are being blackmailed by this procedure into keeping quiet on the Luster report if they want to speak on the more important topic of the economic situation to be dealt with in the speech by the President of the Council. I would therefore suggest that we delete the Luster report, in which event the second part of my amendment will fall.

However, if the Luster Report is to be debated, then my second proposal is that application of Rule 28 be waived in respect of Wednesday's agenda and another arrangement be adopted whereby time allocated would not be divided between the two issues.

**President.** — I call Mr Fanti.

**Mr Fanti.** — (I) Madam President, I wish to remind you of the position expressed by me on behalf of my Group at the Bureau meeting this morning. We consider it necessary to use all the time available to our Group for the discussion of the statement by the new President-in-Office of the Council, since we

consider that debate to be of great political importance. We have therefore indicated our opposition to a reduction of speaking time.

Other groups, for their part, have decided to give up some of the time available to them in order to enable the Luster report to be debated in the afternoon. We obviously have no objection to that. However, we should like the time allocated to the political groups to be divided up between all of them. We also need more speaking time because Mr D'Angelosante and Mr Chambeiron will need to speak in support of certain amendments which would otherwise lapse.

I am therefore asking that, in the case of our Group, the 25 minutes made available to it should be maintained and that a further 10 minutes should be allowed in order to enable our Group to indicate its position on the Luster report. This is what we requested earlier this morning at the Bureau meeting and I urge the group chairmen to agree accordingly.

**President.** — Mr Fanti, it was the need to find time for the motion to reject the budget and the explanations of vote which forced us this morning to make certain adjustments in the draft agenda. At the end of a long discussion a very large majority felt, even though they realised that the formula was not perfect, that the best course of action would be to wind up the debate on the Luster report — which was already debated in May — at the end of Tuesday's sitting.

I think what I have said accurately reflects what was said this morning. Those who do not agree with the enlarged Bureau's decision can support the request to delete the debate on the Luster report.

I call Mr Fanti.

**Mr Fanti.** — (I) Madam President, I am sorry to insist on this point but what you have just said corresponds exactly to what was said in the Bureau; but it is also true — and you must recognize this fact — that the position expressed by me has not been denied and that the time set aside for the Luster report is a result of the agreement by the other political groups not to speak on the statement by the President of the Council, thus allowing two hours speaking time for a debate on the Luster report in the afternoon.

Madam President, I am specifically asking — if this was not made clear enough this morning — for these two hours not to be divided up merely between the groups which agree not to speak in the morning but to be used for all the groups together; otherwise I should have to conclude that the Bureau has not adopted a correct position — and I cannot believe that this is the case.

Fanti

I therefore ask — and I insist on this point — that during the two and one half hours of the debate on the Luster report my Group should be allowed to speak in support of the amendments moved by us, failing which they are liable to lapse under the provisions of the Rules of Procedure. I therefore ask that a few more minutes be allowed to us to make our statements.

**President.** — Mr Fanti, there appears to be some misunderstanding. I do not think that the chairmen of the political groups intended to give up their speaking time in order to allow more time for the other groups. They simply felt that each group had sufficient time to discuss the Presidency's programme and the Luster report. Most of them indicated that they did not intend to keep much time for the Luster report and that most of their speaking time would be devoted to the debate on the new Presidency. The views you have expressed are those of the minority. However the majority clearly does not agree with you. In fact, Mr Fanti, you were the only one who expressed reservations — and indeed more than reservations — since you stated that you wished to use all your speaking time to discuss the Presidency's programme. If you object to the arrangements adopted by the majority, all you have to do is support Mr Blaney's proposal.

I call Mr D'Angelosante.

**Mr D'Angelosante.** — (I) Madam President, I think it right to say that no majority in the Bureau is entitled to require political groups in this Parliament to remain silent on amendments which would in effect prevent this Parliament from discussing important matters for ever. I think this is a delicate matter of principle and one which is vital to the very existence of a Parliament. I cannot understand how the Bureau, after itself establishing the length of speeches for tomorrow's sitting, because of the importance of the matters at issue, can then have seen fit to add, with no change in the speaking time, a subject of such central importance as the amendment of our Rules of Procedure in regard to decisive points relating to the independence of Members of this Parliament.

I therefore urge you, Madam President, and the group chairmen, to give serious thought to ways of preventing it from being said that certain decisive elements of parliamentary democracy have been eliminated from this Parliament and from our Rules of Procedure and that this end has been attained by preventing Members from speaking or by reducing their participation in the debate to nothing at all.

**President.** — On the contrary I believe that it is an expression of democracy to submit to Parliament for its approval a draft agenda drawn up by the Bureau after long discussion.

(Applause from the centre and the right)

The enlarged Bureau has not taken any decision, it has simply amended its earlier proposals. For the moment we are still dealing with proposals on which Parliament has yet to vote.

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Madam President, I want to point out for my own benefit — since there is no need to remind you — and for that of those colleagues who applauded your statement a moment ago that no majority is entitled to go against the fundamental rules of this Parliament. Just as this Parliament cannot violate the Treaties by virtue of which it has been established, so it cannot infringe its own constitution in the shape of its Rules of Procedure. To do so, as I myself habitually do, does not imply that we ourselves condone such violations.

Madam President, there is an old tenet of law which says: *ad impossibilia nemo tenetur*: or no-one is bound to do the impossible. You would like us tomorrow to adopt or explain in a few minutes, 117 amendments whereas in reality it would not even be possible to read out the titles of those amendments in the time allotted to us. If they cannot be explained they will merely lapse, and then we might just as well not even have tabled them.

That brings me to my first point: the enlarged Bureau has proposed a violation of the Rules and in doing so has taken a decision. A further remark: it is not true, I am sorry to say, that we have already debated the Luster report. It has merely been introduced by the rapporteur. Allow me to correct your statement: the report has merely been introduced, it has not been debated.

Madam President, a further important political point: tomorrow you are trying to make us choose between two essential institutional matters: the debate on the Council's policy which is a matter of central interest to us all, and the debate and vote on our own constitution. You are trying to make us participate in a truncated debate and above all — I say this for the benefit of those colleagues who prefer not to listen — in such a way that no member of the majority groups will be allowed to speak. I would ask my colleagues in this House to mark my words carefully: through this Luster report your own political groups are trying to gag you so that in future no Member of the Socialist Group, the Liberal Group, the Christian-Democratic Group or the Conservative Group will be able to get up and speak as they have in the past to explain their votes.

Madam President, quite apart from this set of juridical aberrances, we are being asked to discuss a report, the Luster report, which states that certain votes can in future only be taken by using the electronic voting system. Well, Madam President, if there is a mistake, a

**Pannella**

technical incident, what then? This position, whose underlying principle is totally unacceptable, can only result in technically aberrant proposals.

Madam President, I would stress that in any Assembly which took care to safeguard its rights, your proposal would be inadmissible and the majority in this House is now surpassing its authority and acting illegally. In practical and political terms you cannot require us to take part tomorrow in a debate on the Rules of Procedure during which it will not be possible to speak in support of 100 amendments, as the Rules require, because to do so we should need four times the number of minutes allocated to us. By using the Luster report as an excuse, you are seeking to prevent a debate on President Thorn's statement. I have made my points and I think they were important. Even if you have a numerical majority, no majority — as my colleague, Mr D'Angelosante, rightly said — is entitled to do violence to our rules as you are constantly calling on them to do.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, you have greatly exceeded your speaking time.

I put to the vote the first proposal by Mr Blaney to delete the debate on the Luster report.

The proposal is rejected.

I put to the vote the second proposal by Mr Blaney not to apply Rule 28 to the debate on the Luster report.

The proposal is rejected.

The enlarged Bureau proposes the following agenda for Wednesday:

— **Morning:**

— Statements on the proposals to reject outright the 1980 budget

— von Bismarck report on the economic situation (Doc. 1-228/80)

We have 2 ½ hours for this debate, allocated as follows:

— rapporteurs: ten minutes

Commission: ten minutes

Members: 120 minutes allocated as follows:

Socialist Group: 25 minutes

Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group): 24 minutes

• Communist and Allies Group: 13 minutes

• Liberal and Democratic Group: 12 minutes

• Group of the European Progressive Democrats: 9 minutes

• Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members: 7 minutes

• Non-attached Members: 14 minutes

**3 p.m. to 7 p.m.:**

— Vote on the proposals to reject outright the 1980 budget and motions for resolutions on which the debate has closed.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

The enlarged Bureau also proposes to enter on Thursday's agenda a joint debate on the Peters report (Doc. 1-215/80) and Hoff report (Doc. 1-266/80) on the steel industry and an oral question with debate by the Committee on External Economic Relations to the Commission on relations between the EEC and the USA in the iron and steel sector (Doc. 1-296/80).

The author of the question will not be given priority in the debate and his speaking time will be included in the time allocated to his political group.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

Finally, in view of the fact that Thursday's agenda is overloaded, the enlarged Bureau proposes that only the chairman of the Committee on Budgets should make a statement in reply to the Commission's statement on the 1981 preliminary draft budget.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

I call Mr von der Vring.

**Mr von der Vring.** — (D) Madam President, there is a tradition in this House that certain rules, even if they are unwritten, apply to the implementation of the agenda. Hitherto, at the end of each Friday's sitting in this Chamber we have fixed the time and place of the next part-session. At the June part-session we were irritated to find that this particular point had been advanced by several hours and the Members who wanted to speak on this matter were misled by this change. I therefore expressly request the Bureau to place the 'Dates of the next part-session' as the last item on Friday's sitting and to adhere to that arrangement in future; a fixed place should also be provided on the agenda for some other traditional points. For today's sitting I would find it sufficient for you to give an assurance that no such routine item will suddenly be moved to a different place on the agenda without good reason.

**President.** — Mr von der Vring, the question will be put to the enlarged Bureau at its meeting on Thursday.

Are there any further comments?

The order of business is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Madam President, I just wanted to add a comment and an objection. The agenda resulting from the joint exercise of responsibility by the enlarged Bureau and by our Assembly, is an agenda which prevents us from exercising our parliamentary rights — rights which we undertook to exercise when we stood as candidates.

Consequently I believe that I have been deprived of my rights and duties as a parliamentarian and I shall seek, during this part-session, to make it clear by every possible means to public opinion that we have been gagged. We as Members of Parliament have been gagged and I shall try to bring home to everyone that this gag exists.

I think that this agenda is creating a situation, Madam President, which is making our Parliament resemble a medieval court: what was not possible for a prime minister was possible for the court jester; ministers could do one thing and jesters something quite different: if necessary, we shall now ourselves be the jesters!

**President.** — Mr Pannella, I must point out that the draft agenda was drawn up by the enlarged Bureau in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, which you are so fond of quoting. The enlarged Bureau considered this draft agenda on two occasions, 19 June and again this morning. Even though he was present, the representative of the group to which you belong made no comment or put forward a precise and workable proposal for drawing up the draft agenda in a different way. We are bound by a certain number of constraints: to vote on the budget, to consider a certain number of urgent reports, to hold a political debate on the Council's statement and finally to consider the Luster report.

If your group had put forward a miracle proposal, we would have been most happy to hear it. It did not do so. We held a long discussion in accordance with democratic principles and we have proposed what, in view of the various constraints on us, is the best solution. The plenary sitting has just adopted it in accordance with the best democratic traditions.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the centre and on the right)*

I call Mr Glinne.

**Mr Glinne.** — (F) Excuse us, Madam President, if we have not followed you correctly but could you tell us whether the Prout report on consumer credit still stands on Thursday's agenda?

**President.** — I did not mention the report in view of the fact that, since it is on the agenda, there has been no modification. If the rapporteur or the chairman of the committee asks that it be withdrawn, it will have to be withdrawn. But for the moment, since I have no precise information on the matter, I did not mention the possibility.

#### 10. Speaking Time

**President.** — With the agreement of the enlarged Bureau, I propose to allocate speaking time — except for Wednesday — as set out in the draft agenda.

Are there any comments?

That is agreed.<sup>1</sup>

\*  
\* \*

#### 11. Deadline for tabling amendments

**President.** — I propose to fix the deadlines for tabling amendments for the present part-session at the times shown in the draft agenda.

Are there any objections?

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) One question, Madam President: it is now 5.45 p.m. Would it be too much to ask you to fix 6.30 or 7 p.m. today as the time limit for tabling amendments to the items entered on the agenda for Tuesday and Wednesday? Would that be a dangerous step to take, Madam President?

**President.** — All right, Mr Pannella, 7 p.m. today for items entered on the agenda for 7, 8 and 9 July.

<sup>1</sup>cf. Minutes

12. *Procedure without report*

**President.** — You will find in the minutes the title of the proposal from the Commission to the Council entered on the agenda of the present part-session for consideration without report, pursuant to Rule 27A of the Rules of Procedure. Unless a Member asks leave to speak or amendments are tabled to it before the opening of the sitting on Friday, 11 July 1980, I shall declare this proposal approved.

13. *Electronic voting system*

**President.** — I remind the House that voting cards have been distributed. In order to enable the voting to be conducted without difficulty this week, I ask Members who have not yet done so to collect their cards from Room 1138.

14. *Decision on urgency*

**President.** — The next item is the decision on the urgency of the motion for a resolution by *Mr Collins and others (Doc. 1-282/80): Development of better cooperation between Parliament and Council.*

I call Mr Hänsch to speak against the request for urgent debate.

**Mr Hänsch.** — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the motion tabled by Mr Collins, Mr Johnson and others, raises a number of important matters pertaining to relations between two institutions of the European Community. The subject of this motion, namely the development of improved cooperation between Parliament and the Council, is, however, also the subject of a report now being prepared by the Political Affairs Committee. I am myself the rapporteur and the report will be placed before Parliament later this year. Ladies and gentlemen, I believe that the limited time available for the work of the plenary session should not be taken up today by debates which will be taken very thoroughly only a few weeks later.

(Applause)

It is surely not the proper style for our parliamentary work to deal separately today with one item from a general report. This is an important motion, but surely not so urgent as to warrant rapid attention on Friday. Ladies and gentlemen, I appeal to you not to support this request for urgent procedure.

**President.** — I call Mr Johnson to speak in favour of the motion.

**Mr Johnson.** — Madam President, this motion calls on the Bureau and the enlarged Bureau to enter into immediate discussions with the Council with a view to improving the conciliation procedure. It calls upon the President of Parliament to report back to the House before or during the December part-session.

Now, of course, there will always be those — and they may even be on my own side of the House too — who, like the last speaker, say, let this matter be referred back to the appropriate committee. Of course, in the fullness of time the appropriate committee will refer it to the appropriate subcommittee and other committees will be asked for their advice. And a year or two from now, Madam President, we might have a chance of debating the matter. Sometime after that negotiations with the Council might get under way. Now, I believe the matter is much too important for that. Certainly it is more important and more germane than many other matters which this House has treated on Friday mornings over the last year.

This motion is signed — I think it is important to mention this — by the chairmen of no less than eight committees of this House and by the chairwoman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Women. It is signed by the chairman of the institutional subcommittee of the Political Affairs Committee, by the rapporteur of the Committee on Budgets and by a former Secretary-General of this Parliament.

What I am saying is this: after one year many of us feel that there is one major limitation on the work of this House, namely, that apart from the budget and certain trade matters many of the amendments passed in this Chamber are not even considered by the Council, let alone adopted. I can say quite frankly that in my own particular sphere — the environment field — many of our amendments do not receive so much as the time of day. This state of affairs, Madam President, cannot be allowed to continue. We need a better conciliation procedure; we need a better dialogue with the Council and the moment for the authorities of this Parliament to begin the dialogue with the Council is this year, not next. That is why, even though I recognize, as many of us do, I think, the limitations of Friday morning debates, it is worth entering this matter on the agenda for this week.

**President.** — I call Mr Klepsch to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group).

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) Madam President, I shall be very brief. I agree with Mr Hänsch.

**President.** — I put the request to the vote.

The request for urgent debate is rejected.



**President**

The motion for a resolution will therefore be referred to the appropriate committee.

15. *Action taken on the opinions and proposals of Parliament*

**President.** — The next item is the Commission's statement on action taken on the opinions and proposals of Parliament<sup>1</sup>.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Madam President, the document I received from the Commission and the document which I received from the Parliament, Document PE 66.031, are not in accord with each other. The document I received from the Commission says that the fifteen reports received favourable opinions and did not give rise to a request by Parliament for formal amendments. Included in these fifteen reports is the report by my honourable friend Mr Kirk on the need to restructure the inshore fishing industry. If you look at the Parliament document, Madam President, you will see that Parliament called for an extension of the scope of the objective and structural measures and introduced an amendment to that effect. I cannot understand why the Commission is pretending that the Parliament did not ask for changes. In point of fact the House did so. I hope that when they forward it to the Council, they will also forward what my honourable friend's report said and what the House agreed to in the debate we had on inshore fishing. What the Commission has put forward is inaccurate.

In conclusion, Madam President, may I turn to the various issues dealt with in paragraph 3 of the Commission's document where it says that the Commission is preparing amendments to all various documents, and that they are going to be forwarded to the Council and Parliament in September. Does that mean that Parliament will have an opportunity to see what these new amendments from the Commission are going to be? Are we going to have an opportunity of debating them? If it is true then I am delighted, as this is something which has never happened before. Is the Commission really proposing to send back to this House all the amendments they are going to make following our amendments? I want to have an assurance from the President of the Commission, who I am delighted to see is present, that it is exactly what he is going to do; because that is what the document says. I assume that, for the first time, the House is actually going to know what the Commission is sending to the Council. I am delighted, if it really is so.

**President.** — I call Mr Natali.

**Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (I) Madam President, Mr Scott-Hopkins has referred to paragraph 2 of our document and in particular to Mr Kirk's report on a provisional joint action for the restructuring of the inshore fishing industry. I would remind Mr Scott-Hopkins that Parliament did not formally request an amendment. It merely expressed a wish but it did not request a formal amendment on the basis of Article 149. I therefore believe that the Commission's text is correct.

As to paragraph 3, I would confirm to Mr Scott-Hopkins that we forward and shall continue to forward — as we have always done in the past — to this Parliament the amendments made by us on the basis of the opinions delivered by it.

**President.** — I call Mr Kirk.

**Mr Kirk.** — (DK) Madam President, there are clearly widely divergent views of the report I submitted at the last part-session on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture. I can confirm Mr Scott-Hopkins' statement today that Parliament, or at least the rapporteur and the Committee on Agriculture, expressed clear reservations on the Commission's proposal, which they approved subject to the Commission's acceptance of the amendments initially tabled by the Committee and adopted by Parliament at the last part-session.

**President.** — I call Mr Adams.

**Mr Adams.** — Madam President, on the Friday of the last part-session in Strasbourg we adopted a resolution on political rights in South Africa and asked that that resolution be forwarded to the South African Government. Are you in a position, Madam President, to advise Parliament on the nature of the reply, if any, that has been received from the South African Government?

**President.** — Mr Adams, two things must be distinguished where the question to relations with South Africa are concerned.

In the first place, at the request of the political groups I personally sent a letter before a motion for a resolution had been adopted, drawing the attention of the South African Government to the situation of Mr Mange, who has been sentenced to death. On this point I unfortunately received a very negative reply setting out the conditions under which Mr Mange had been arrested and sentenced and stating that no other course of action had been possible: the laws of the

<sup>1</sup> See Annex

**President**

country had been correctly observed and the sentence was justified. A photocopy of this letter has been sent to the chairmen of the political groups.

With regard to the resolution, this has been duly forwarded, but we have not received any reply.

I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — I am a little confused — not with regard to Mr Kirk's point which, I think, has been put quite clearly — concerning paragraph 3 of the Commission's document where they say they are going to forward to the Council and the Parliament the amended proposals on the various documents by Mr Martens, Madam Roudy, Mr Jürgens, Madam Fullet etc. They are going to send to the Parliament amended proposals! Now what will be the method of dealing with these? Will they go to committee again, be debated in committee and then come onto the floor of the House? This has not happened in the past, as Vice-President Natali pointed out. Is that what is going to happen from now onwards and in the future? We really must get this clear now.

**President.** — I call Mr Natali.

**Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (I) Madam President, after indicating our acceptance of Parliament's amendments, we forward them to the Council and we also send them to Parliament again for its information. I say for its information, because we cannot then reopen the procedure.

**President.** — I call Mr Sherlock.

**Mr Sherlock.** — Madam President, with regard to the report by Mrs Roudy — which is the result of a very considerable amount of work and study — the second page of the Commission's document states that the Commission is preparing an amended proposal which will be forwarded to the Council and Parliament in September. According to the *Financial Times* of several days ago this was submitted to the Council and rejected by the veto of one of the Council's Member States. It seems a strange contradiction, yet again.

**President.** — Mr Sherlock, I think that there is some confusion.

I call Mr Natali.

**Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (I) Madam President, with reference to the Roudy report on the risks of serious accidents, we indicate in

our document that we have accepted a number of amendments put forward by Parliament. One of those amendments was not approved by the Council of Ministers of the Environment. The Commission did not withdraw this amendment and it has thus respected the wishes of Parliament.

**President.** — I call Mr Kirk.

**Mr Kirk.** — (DK) Madam President, will you make sure that we obtain a reply to my report, which was tabled during the last part-session, as there is an obvious discrepancy between the views of the Commission and of Parliament? Can I therefore assume that we will have an answer by the next part-session? Would you please make sure of that, Madam President?

**President.** — I call Mr Natali.

**Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (I) Madam President, there may be differences of interpretation between the document presented by the Commission and the text submitted by the secretariat of Parliament.

The Commission's document states that Mr Kirk's report was approved without any requests for formal amendments to the Commission's proposal. I have Parliament's resolution in front of me and it simply requests the Commission and Council to widen the scope and objectives of the structural provisions for the fisheries sector. That is an indication of future intentions which has nothing to do with the proposal in question and was not set down in a proposal for an amendment.

**President.** — I call Mr Patterson.

**Mr Patterson.** — Madam President, I wish to make a general remark following your reply to Mr Adams. It seems quite clear that this item on our agenda is becoming increasingly important as the months progress. Whereas the agenda item allows us to put questions to the Commission on action taken by the Commission, it has not, until today, given us the opportunity to ask questions on resolutions passed by the House which require other action. Madam President, you set an extremely valuable precedent today by answering a question on action taken in relation to the South African Government. Could we in future, on Mondays, when we take this item, also have an item on the agenda when you, personally, can reply to questions on those matters which do not concern the Commission? As we are increasingly taking decisions which involve forwarding information or documents to bodies such as the South African Government, this

**Patterson**

seems to me wholly in accordance with best parliamentary practice.

**President.** — Mr Patterson, when, at the request of a committee, a political group or the enlarged Bureau I intervene personally and receive a reply I forward it to the chairman of the committee or the group concerned. Of course in the case of questions which I simply forward to the Council or the Commission, the replies are given officially by the Council or the Commission. However, when I intervene directly I systematically inform those concerned of the replies received.

I call Mr Kirk.

**Mr Kirk.** — (DK) I must insist that I am correct in my interpretation of the report we were discussing a moment ago. I am also certain that Mr Natali has misinterpreted Parliament's opinion. When we were considering the report in the Committee on Agriculture we disagreed with the Commission and made this clear to the Commission officials present. They raised all kinds of objections to our views but we adopted the report almost unanimously. It was then adopted by Parliament last month, so the Commission officials must be perfectly well aware of the wide divergence between Parliament's and the Commission's views on the criteria for the restructuring of the inshore fishing industry. I must insist on an answer from the Commission.

**President.** — I call Mr Natali.

**Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (I) Madam President, I am sorry but I have in front of me the minutes of the sitting to which Mr Kirk refers, namely the sitting of Friday, 20 June. There was no amendment to the Commission's proposal for a regulation. We therefore indicated in our document that the text was approved without any formal request for an amendment. It is true that the resolution sets out a number of wishes but Parliament voted no formal amendments. We have therefore correctly indicated exactly what happened.

**President.** — Mr Kirk, I feel it is time to close this debate. No amendment was adopted formally calling on the Commission to change its proposal. The House simply indicated its wishes regarding future policy.

**Mr Kirk.** — (DK) Madam President, my report contains two very clear amendments to the Commission's proposal. One is contained in paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution, in which we refer to the scope of the regulation, and the other in paragraph 6, which deals with the vessels to be covered by the measures

for restructuring the inshore fishing industry. I hope you will clear the matter up, Madam President, as I am not very happy to see the Commission claim that the Committee on Agriculture and Parliament did have not express any definite reservations on the Commission's restructuring proposals, while we in Parliament want to see different criteria. I think this a very important point.

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Vice-President Natali is, of course, quite right. There was no official amendment adopted on the proposal of the Commission. That is absolutely true and I am not attempting to argue with him about that. All I think my honourable friend is saying, and what I am saying, is that this House clearly expressed its feelings as to what it wanted done, and one assumed, perhaps unnaturally, that the Commission would listen to what we said and would therefore amend its proposal. The Commission, obviously, has been bloody-minded and has not listened to this House and has not amended its proposal. Unhappily, it has the right to act in this way, but I think it is a very bad precedent and I hope it will not happen again.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the right)*

**President.** — There is some confusion. It is difficult to take the view that action taken on a report without amendments should be the same as that taken on a report to which amendments have been attached. Reservations should not be considered as amendments as those opposed to these reservations could feel that the minority point of view was being favoured. We could perhaps end this debate by asking Mr Kirk, Mr Natali and the competent committee to study the problem.

## 16. Question Time

**President.** — The next item is *Question Time* (Doc. 1-287/80). We begin with questions to the Commission.

Question No 1 by Lord Douro (H-95/80):

Officials from the Commission have now visited the Republic of Ireland, the United Kingdom and France to investigate the anomalies concerning VAT charged on bloodstock and supplies of training services. Will the Commission now disclose whether or not they believe that the Republic of Ireland or France are in any way contravening the Sixth VAT Directive?

**Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission.** — The Commission has decided to commence proceedings

**Tugendhat**

against France, under Article 169 of the EEC Treaty, for contravention of the 6th VAT Directive in the establishment of maximum taxation amounts for importation and deliveries within the State, of horses of high value, and to keep under review the problem of the services of racehorse trainers with a view to establishing with the Irish authorities the new system of taxation to be applied to those services.

In the case concerning maximum taxable amounts, the infraction is clear. In the cases concerning the VAT treatment of racehorse trainers, however, the Commission discovered that different rules are applied in accordance with the practice and conditions existing in the State concerned. At the present stage of Community law such disparities do not necessarily give rise to infractions. The 6th Directive leaves a number of matters unauthorized. The matter we are concerned with here is one of them.

**Lord Douro.** — I welcome at least part of the answer that the Commissioner has given. I would in passing like to regret the absence of the Commissioner directly responsible for this matter. I feel that in deciding to take the French Government to the European Court the Commission has, on part of this problem, taken note of representations made by Members of this House and others concerned. Nevertheless, on 13 November 1979, the Commissioner with direct responsibility did say in a letter that it was the Commission's opinion that neither the French nor the Irish practices in relation to the application of VAT in these cases was in conformity with VAT law, and I would therefore be grateful for more details from the Commission on why it has decided not to take the Irish to court as well as the French. I must say that I am not convinced by the rather complicated answer that the Commissioner has given as to why the matter of training services is not also being referred to the Court.

**Mr Tugendhat.** — As the honourable Member says, the Commission initially decided to commence proceedings against both countries, but, having done so, it received representations from the permanent representatives of the two countries concerned, as a result of which it in fact decided to suspend proceedings so that investigations could be undertaken in those two countries. Following those investigations, we did in fact institute proceedings, as I have just said, against France. As far as the Irish are concerned, there are two points which I think should be borne in mind. One is that the Irish authorities have offered to undertake an immediate review of their system, with a view to taxing the proportion of a trainer's services which represents training in the strict sense. This leads me to my final point which is that it does appear that in Ireland the profession of trainer is very much part and parcel of the normal agricultural activities of the farmer, rather than being a separate profession, and

this is a factor that has certainly influenced the Commission's decision.

*(Laughter)*

**Mr Turner.** — It seems to me that the Commissioner still has not answered the question as to why the Commission is not suing the Irish as well. The French at least pay a derisory carcase value but the Irish pay nothing at all. If they are to be granted some transitional period and I do not know if that is the case when will that end, and has the Commission made sure that when it does end the Irish will come into line? Lastly may I ask how long will it take to bring the French to book in the Commission's suit against them, which is now coming before the Court?

**Mr Tugendhat.** — Of course it is impossible for me to say how long these proceedings will take, or indeed forecast their outcome. As far as the Irish point is concerned, as I said in answer to the initial question, the Irish are actually reviewing their current practice and this is a point to which we attach great importance.

IN THE CHAIR: MR PFLIMLIN

*Vice-President*

**President.** — Question No 2 by Mr Seligman (H-160/80):

Following the decision by ASCO, the Arab Satellite Communication Organization, in Rabat, to issue a new tender later this year for the project ARABSAT, what steps is the Commission taking, possibly in conjunction with the European Investment Bank, to ensure that Community firms compete successfully for a project that could have incalculable results for dialogue between the peoples of the Arab world and of Europe, noting the steps that US firms have taken to be removed from the Arab boycott list for the second tender?

**Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission.** — *(F)* The Commission is aware of the importance that should be attached to this project from the angle both of the European industry and of future relations between Europe and the Arab world. Having said that, how do things now stand? The Community industries have set up a consortium and in liaison with the Space Agency and their respective states, have put forward proposals accompanied by credit lines to enable them to participate in the bidding. The Commission has received no request directly from the industrial concerns or from the Member States for Community financial instruments to be used to ensure better prospects of success for this project. If such a request were formulated, the Commission would study it in the light of the political declaration which I made earlier on the industrial and political significance of this project.

**Mr Seligman.** — I welcome that information from the Commission. It is certain that if Europe is going to compete with the United States and Japan in the satellites field, we must marshal the entire strength of the Community, and therefore I should like to ask the Commission if it cannot provide more help since, with the prestige of the Commission behind them, this consortium might have a better chance of competing with the other firms and nations vying for this contract.

**Mr Davignon.** — (F) I share the honourable Member's view that we should have a greater chance of beating Japan and the United States in this project if we were to present a proposal with real Community backing. This project is obviously of interest to the Community but as long as the consortium has not contacted us we can do nothing; we can hardly be expected to place advertisements in the press asking them to get in touch with us.

(Laughter)

**President.** — Question No 3 by Mrs Ewing (H-166/80):

What progress has been made in establishing the FAST research programme and with what existing specialized research groups in the Community is FAST planning to collaborate; and in view of the unique research capabilities of universities and other bodies in Scotland, how much of the 4.4 million EUA available is being spent in Scotland in the period to 1983?

**Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the European Commission.** — (NL) Mrs Ewing's question gives me an opportunity to outline briefly the present situation of the FAST programme which, as you know, is extremely important, particularly as it shows the potential of an effective European research and development policy.

The research was already begun last autumn; the three important topics covered are new employment and occupational technologies, data-processing technologies and, finally, new prospects based on bio-engineering.

An initial report has already been prepared under the title 'Europe in the process of change'; it describes the prospects for new developments in this area in the eighties and nineties. European research workers have shown great interest. At present some 65 groups are working on these projects and between 100 and 200 groups are expected to participate in this research through the FAST network.

I now come to the honourable Member's specific question: the Commission has received a total of 224

proposed projects, three of them from Scotland. A Scottish institute is at present directly engaged in these activities. In my view this programme is extremely important for the development of an adequate scientific and technological policy in the European Community.

**Mrs Ewing.** — Does the Commissioner not think it would be a good thing to concentrate the research-programming of the Member States into a more central area? He might not be too surprised if I suggested that it is time that an institute of some kind was set up in Scotland, since this country would be eminently suitable for conducting and coordinating research because of its particular background of having being the leader in the Industrial Revolution and having very scientifically-based universities and many, perhaps too many, skilled graduates available to undertake some of the coordination work. Does he not feel that Community research should be more centralized and would he bear in mind my suggestion?

**Mr Vredeling.** — (NL) I understand the honourable Member to be saying that Scotland would be interested in accommodating a Community research institute. I can only take note of the fact that Scotland is one of the candidates but can obviously make no promise on this point.

**Sir Peter Vanneck.** — Will the FAST research programme take account of experience in the United States and how will it examine the new technology needs of the space and defence-related industries?

**Mr Vredeling.** — (NL) Important institutes are involved in the FAST research programme and I think I can safely assure the honourable Member that know-how available in this area in the United States and elsewhere will be drawn on.

In response to his specific question about space research and defence-related industries, the Commission is well-aware of the enormous technological spin-off generated by them. I do not know whether space research programmes are specifically included in the FAST study. However, the subjects which have been brought to my attention lead me to believe that there is a definite link between space travel and modern data-processing technologies.

I believe that the defense aspect is something of a taboo subject in this sphere. I should like to comment in more detail, but we have only recently discussed this matter at length in Parliament.

**Mr Hutton.** — May I ask the Commissioner if he could tell us if the subject of long-range weather-forecasting radar is among the projects which are being

**Hutton**

considered in this programme and, if not, would he not agree with me that this is perhaps one technological subject which would be appreciated by every section of society, and would he further agree with me that Scotland is the ideal place for such work to be done?

*(Laughter)*

**Mr Vredeling.** — *(NL)* I do not know whether Scotland is the ideal place for long range weather forecasting. I could mention a few other places which might have been ideal this summer for long range forecasts.

I think this question about weather forecasts is linked with the previous one about space travel, given the importance of satellites. I am sure that this modern technology will be one of the subjects considered in the FAST programme.

**Mr Seligman.** — Will the Commission ensure that FAST research groups are chosen impartially for the qualifications they have and not on a geographical basis or because of the proximity of whisky supplies? Can we have a statement on the distribution of contracts by nations and not by sub-regions of nations?

**Mr Vredeling.** — *(NL)* I understand the purpose of that question, but I have some hesitation in saying that a distribution of research activities on a national basis is very much better than a regional distribution. It seems to me that we must choose between the institutes which have the highest reputation in this field and that we should not look first to regions or countries.

*(Applause from some benches on the right)*

**Mr Seal.** — Research programmes are all very well and the Commissioner has told us that, in this one, work is being done on information systems. That is very laudable; but research is of no use unless the results are made known. I would like to know from the Commissioner what special steps he is taking to ensure that the results of this work are disseminated particularly as far as industry is concerned. Could the Commissioner tell us if he is taking any special measures at all?

**Mr Vredeling.** — *(NL)* The Commission has obviously not prepared this whole programme with a view to hiding its light under a bushel, if I may say so. We shall naturally publish or help to publish the results that warrant this.

**Mr President.** — Question No 4 by Mr Seal (H-276/80, formerly O-122/79/rev.):

The European textile industry is being threatened from many sides. The world's developing countries are increasing textile production, the eastern European countries and China are exporting low-cost textiles to the Community, and in addition the entry of Greece, Spain and Portugal into the EEC is going to cause many problems for the EEC textile industry.

In view of these developments, when will the Commission produce a European textile industrial plan for the next five years which will guarantee and retain a percentage of the Community market for the Community industry, and will it also indicate how the industry should be strengthened to meet these new challenges.

Further, why has the Commission not designated the textile industry as one to which monetary assistance will be made available from the non-quota section of the Regional Fund where it has been reported that 220 million EUA has been set aside to help specific industries offset the effects of the entry of Greece, Spain and Portugal into the Community?

**Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission.** — *(F)* The honourable Member's question has several aspects. Firstly, as regards relations between the Community and most of the developing countries referred to in the question, bilateral agreements cover trade in the textiles sector under the existing multifibre arrangement. Secondly, the Community has concluded with some countries with which it maintains preferential links a number of arrangements involving quantitative elements; this also applies to the countries which are candidates for accession. Finally, it has concluded an agreement with China and it maintains independent restrictions for trade with the state-trading countries. In other words, practically all of the low-cost countries which export to the Community are covered by arrangements of this kind.

I turn now to the second aspect of the question: it is not within the power of the Commission or Community to guarantee a share of the common market to Community producers. The Community must respect the international agreements in which it participates and these agreements prevent any such guarantee.

Now for the third aspect: the Commission is of the opinion that the instruments available to it — the quota section of the Regional Fund and the Social Fund — can be used in favour of textile companies which make applications in conformity with the criteria laid down. In this context, during the last four years excluding 1980, over 400 million units of account have been spent from the Regional Fund for reconversion in the textile industry regions.

In answer to the last point, the Commission did not feel it possible to take special account, in allocating

**Davignon**

funds from the non-quota section, of the difficulties which stem specifically from the crisis of the textile industry since it chose two industries on the basis of the resources available to it — the steel industry and the shipbuilding sector. In the case of the non-quota section, the intention is not to assist particular industries but, in the case of France and Italy, to aid two regions which quite obviously need to adjust to the enlargement of the Community. Our actions are directed at infrastructures, craft industries and, more specifically, the small and medium-sized undertakings without any distinction based on their specific sphere of activity.

Mr President, I have answered at some length, but the honourable Member's question had four different aspects.

**Mr Seal.** — First of all, let me say to the House how bitterly disappointed I am that this oral question with debate has been converted into a written question by the enlarged Bureau. We do need a debate in this Parliament on textiles. The state of the textile industry is critical. All Member States in the Community except one are losing jobs. The United Kingdom was the first to be affected because it has a more centralized and more efficient retailing system. But the Commissioner talked about regions, and let me say, that I now have accurate figures for my region: in the wool textile industry we have lost jobs at an average rate of 2,100 every month for the last 12 months, and this is accelerating. So that region certainly needs some help. There are only 50 000 people employed in wool. It will only last another two years unless help is given. There is going to be no-one left, so I hope the Commissioner will take that on board when he is looking at regions.

Could the Commission here, before the House, emphatically deny that it is deliberately allowing the textile industry to be lost in favour of the more technological industries within the Community, and will it give every trade union in the Member States and every industrial organization in the Member States an assurance to that effect?

**Mr Davignon.** — (F) On the procedural aspect, namely the point as to whether a question of this importance can be dealt with in the context of Question Time, the Commission shares the honourable Member's views. In view of the difficulties which exist in the textile sector, it may well be appropriate for a general debate prepared by the committee responsible, to be held in this Parliament and the Commission favours that idea.

As to the actual question put to me, I can give the most emphatic assurance possible, since that was the term used, that all the efforts made by the Commission to regulate trade in textile products with third countries have had as their sole aim and justification the

need to maintain a Community textile industry; that is the purpose of our efforts to promote technological progress in this particular industry. In the United States, for example, technological progress has enabled the American textile industry to become competitive once again in the international market. We are continuing our efforts to this end. In this context, the Regional Fund and the Social Fund will be used to promote staff training and new technologies. I hope that the declaration that I have made here together with the statement made by me in the honourable Member's region, will be received with the seriousness that they deserve since I have made them as extremely emphatic statements.

**President.** — Several Members of Parliament have asked to speak. However, since I must limit the number of speeches I can only call three Members.

I call Mr Spicer on a point of order.

**Mr Spicer.** — Mr President, I am sure members of the House are grateful to you for the statement you have just made, but I would point out that we are now on Question No 4 and I believe there are 42 questions to the Commission. Over the last three or four sessions of this Parliament we have moved slowly but surely into a situation when questions are not being asked of the Commission, but statements are being made to the Commission which invite lengthy replies from the Commission. I sympathize with the Commissioners in this. But Question Time that was instituted in this Parliament at the instigation of Sir Peter Kirk and of our Group is fast becoming anything but a Question Time. You would have the full support of the House, Mr President, if you insisted upon questions being asked briefly and to the point, hopefully with the result, too, that the replies will be in the same vein.

*(Applause from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)*

**President.** — That of course is the problem facing us. Question Time will only be effective if Members confine themselves to putting questions and keep their question short. No, Mr Hume, we cannot waste time on points of order.

**Mr Beazley.** — Would the Commissioner not agree that the continuance of a strong European textile and clothing industry is essential to the economic health of the Community and will the Commission make suitable proposals as soon as possible to provide these industries with appropriate support and adequate, but not excessive, protection on a European basis?

*(Applause from certain quarters of the European Democratic Group)*

**Mr Davignon.** — (F) Through the range of external measures to which I drew your attention just now, the Commission does grant the 'adequate protection' to which the honourable Member referred. This is confirmed in the document that we have recently forwarded to the Council reviewing the operation of these agreements in the past two years.

Secondly, as regards the possibility of ensuring more rational control over the readjustment of the textile industry in line with these new objectives — because this industry forms a necessary part of the European economy — I can only note that the financing proposals figuring against Article 375 in the budget are blocked by the Council which cannot reach agreement; moreover the proposals which we have put forward for the definition of a number of guidelines have also been blocked by the Council.

The Commission cannot be asked to do more than put forward proposals and it cannot be blamed if those proposals are not even discussed afterwards.

*(Mr Pannella asks repeatedly to speak on a point of order, but is not called)*

**President.** — My point of view, Mr Pannella, is as valid as yours. I am responsible for the smooth running of Question Time which could be disrupted by points of order.

*(Applause)*

**Mr Key.** — Can the Commission state whether and in what way certain third countries, which are major exporters of textiles to the Community, are currently violating the conventions of the International Labour Organization with regard to working conditions and trade-union rights, and, if not, will the Commission examine this problem and will the Commission agree that such violations constitute unfair competition to a Community industry which is in jeopardy, especially in the United Kingdom and in Yorkshire in particular?

**Mr Davignon.** — (F) I am grateful to the honourable Member for his question which raises a highly important and delicate matter. At present we are holding talks with the International Labour Organization in Geneva on the conventions which have been adopted and on the repercussions which failure to observe them might have in the present situation. During the next few weeks we shall be able to give more detailed information as our discussions with the ILO progress. That is the proper context for dealing with these problems because we must not give the impression of using violations of these conventions as a pretext for commercial measures, whereas in reality the issue is one of substance and of rules that must be respected.

**Mr Martin.** — (F) A number of documents drafted by the Commission and Parliament recognize the serious consequences for the French textile industry in particular of the enlargement of the EEC to include Spain, Portugal and Greece. Mr Davignon has just confirmed this.

Could the Commission provide the Assembly at an early date with a report in the greatest possible detail on the textile industry in these three countries and on the specific consequences of the accession of these countries to the Community, with particular reference to France?

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, you are chairing a parliamentary assembly and not a board of directors!

**President.** — I am chairing an Assembly which wishes to carry out useful work without losing time on procedural debates!

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**Mr Davignon.** — (F) In answer to Mr Martin, I would point out that I did not say that there were special difficulties due to enlargement in the textile sector. I merely referred to a remark by Mr Seal who mentioned the application of the non-quota section of the Regional Fund in a French region and in a region of Italy. For the rest, if the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, as the committee responsible, wishes us to hold a more detailed debate on the various aspects of the situation of the textile industry, the Commission will gladly give information on the repercussions of enlargement on all the Community Member States.

**President.** — I call on a point of order Mr Hume who has already asked for the floor several times.

**Mr Hume.** — Mr President, while I respect your wish to expedite the business of Question Time, might I ask you to exercise your judgement on the importance of question. Since we cannot hold a debate on it and since this particular question before the house is of extreme importance to many of us, given that the textile industry has its strongest base in the already most disadvantaged regions of this Community and that hardly a day passes when thousands of jobs are not lost, I would appeal to you to allow further discussion on this question.

**President.** — A moment ago Mr Davignon stated that he felt it would be useful to have a wide-ranging debate on the very serious problems affecting the textile industry. For my own part I share that view. However, at the moment we must conform to the



**President**

discipline of Question Time. I hope that we will have a wider debate at a later date.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

**Mr Pannella.** — (*F*) Mr President, I simply wish to remind you — and I would invite my colleagues to consult the Rules of Procedure — that Rule 32(2) tacitly implies that procedural motions and references to the Rules take precedence over the principal issue and suspend the debate thereon.

I would therefore point out to you, Mr President, that when you denied our English colleague the right to speak on a point of order you were abusing the Rules of Procedure.

**President.** — Your statement has been noted.

Question No 5 by Mr Capanna (H-263/80, formerly O-157/79):

The Consorzio di Bonifica per la Sinistra Tagliamento (CBST — Association for the Redevelopment of the Left Bank of the Tagliamento) intends to use several billion lire of EEC funds allocated to the earthquake area in Friuli for land redevelopment in the Pantianicco area (commune of Mereto di Tomba, province of Udine);

A number of citizens are opposing this project and have informed the Office of the Agricultural Councilor for the Friuli-Venezia-Gulia region of the illegal operations of the CBST;

Will the Commission give Parliament the following information:

- What urgent measures does it intend to take to ensure that EEC finance intended for restoration and rehabilitation work in the Friuli earthquake area is not diverted from the objective indicated by the Community institutions and illegally used for large-scale and completely new land development operations which are in no way connected with the earthquake damage?
- What measures has the Commission already taken or does it intend to take as a matter of urgency to check in general that Community funds allocated to the Friuli earthquake area are used for the correct purpose?

**Mr Natali, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (*I*) In the context of community action to make good the damage caused to agriculture in Friuli by the 1976 earthquake, the Commission made available 1 thousand million lire for a project for the 'renewal and

restructuring of the irrigation and ancillary works in the commune of Mereto di Tomba in the province of Udine'. That project had been put forward by the Sinistra del Tagliamento irrigation consortium. The engineering works of this irrigation system had in fact been damaged to such an extent by the earthquake that their operation was jeopardized.

The Community contribution can — in conformity with the Commission's decision — only be used for performance of the works for which it has been earmarked, namely for the renewal and restructuring of the irrigation and ancillary works in the commune of Mereto di Tomba. This contribution will be paid out, as a function of the progress of the works concerned, when the necessary conditions are met. As yet no request has been made for payment. We are aware of certain difficulties encountered in the performance of the work but these do not in our view affect the nature of the project to be financed. These difficulties are attributable rather to the structure of the beneficiary body which is an irrigation consortium.

Community aid to repair damage to civilian infrastructures, this aid being administered by the European Development Fund, has been the subject of five Commission decisions for a total commitment of 9,375 million lire. One of those decisions has now been fully implemented; the others have been carried out to a proportion equivalent of 75 % of the initial commitment. These decisions relate to 11 projects, 7 of which have already been the subject of on the spot checks and verifications on the basis of the relevant supporting documents. These controls have demonstrated that the Community contribution has been used in conformity with the objectives announced in the requests for intervention on the basis of which the Commission took its decisions.

The irrigation consortium for the Sinistra del Tagliamento has not been the subject of any decision to make available a Commission contribution on the basis of the aid measures referred to earlier.

**Mr Capanna.** — (*I*) Vice-President Natali who, like me, is an Italian knows full well that the case to which I have referred is nothing new as regards the conduct of the majority party in our country: that party applies the methods of the Camorra to attain its unprincipled objectives.

I have here documentary evidence to confirm my statements. I conclude from the Commissioner's statement that no detailed investigation has been made of the irrigation consortium for the Sinistra del Tagliamento, otherwise the Commission would have realized, for example, that the meeting held to put the Pantianicco irrigation consortium into liquidation — a necessary step for the incorporation of this particular consortium into the wider consortium for the Sinistra

**Capanna**

del Tagliamento — was patently illegal and held under conditions contrary to the consortium's own statute. The illegality was so blatant, and that is why I spoke of the methods of the Camorra, that a person who died in 1960 was recorded as present.

My further question to the Commission is this: when does it intend to pay out the thousand million to which it referred? Secondly, does it intend to seek further accurate details of the illegalities already committed and not merely of any such illegalities which may be committed in the future?

**Mr Natali.** — (I) I have already said that the Commission has not yet paid out any funds. Obviously when it comes to meet its commitments it will have to obtain guarantees as to the conformity of the work performed.

As regards the irregularities to which Mr Capanna referred, I believe that he has ample possibilities open to him to denounce them to the juridical authorities of his own country.

**President.** — Question No 6 by Mrs Cinciari Rodano (H-264/80, formerly 0-15/80):

- Considering that the Commission of the European Communities, on 10 December 1979, informed the European Parliament's Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport of the reasons for the postponement of the meeting of the Council of Education Ministers which had been scheduled for 6 November 1979 and of the Commission's commitment to seek agreement with the Danish Government with a view to arranging a meeting for the end of 1979 or the beginning of 1980;
- bearing in mind that the first three months of 1980 have already passed without a new date for the meeting having been announced;
- bearing in mind furthermore that the postponement of the meeting will lead to further delays in decisions on important matters such as the teaching of foreign languages in the Community, the admission of students from other Member States to higher education institutions and equal opportunities for girls in education and training;

The Commission is asked to inform the European Parliament of the steps taken by the Commission, the difficulties encountered and the likelihood of the Council of Education Ministers meeting at an early date.

**Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission.** — The House will, I am sure, share the Commission's satisfaction that a meeting of the Council of Education Ministers finally took place on 27 June and that the Ministers reached agreement on five specific measures for the implementation of points contained in the 1976 action programme.

**Mr Papapietro.** — (I) This is in reality an old question which was not properly discussed at the proper time. Members of Parliament have put this question on several different occasions. We should like the President of the Commission to say something more specific about the teaching of foreign languages in the Community; about the admission of students from different Member States to institutions of higher education and about equality of opportunity for girls in access to education and training. These are the main points of the question and the topics of immediate interest to us.

**Mr Jenkins.** — The Council, which we would have liked to have seen meeting earlier was a productive Council. When it eventually took place it centred almost precisely on the points mentioned by the honourable Member. Discussion in this Council centred first on the education of migrant workers and their children, secondly on the promotion of foreign language teaching; thirdly on equality of educational opportunities for girls; fourthly on the study of Europe and the Community in schools and fifthly on the admission of students from other Member States to institutions of higher education.

Full agreement was reached on all matters of substance. The Commission was particularly pleased that agreement was reached on the principles and implementing measures concerning the admission of students from other Member States to universities and other higher educational institutions. This represents a major contribution towards freedom of movement in the educational field.

There are certain procedural problems about the Education Council. There are some doubts on the part of one Member State as to how exactly it lies within Community competence. But here, after some delay, we made major practical progress on exactly the issues to which we attach importance and to which the honourable Member attaches importance.

**Mrs Nielsen.** — (Dk) The reason I wish to speak at this point is contained in Mr Jenkins' last paragraph, when he said that there were some doubts on the part of one Member State as to the Community's competence to deal with education. As a Dane and as a European I have been deeply worried by the Danish Social Democratic Government's attitude to cooperation on education at Community level. My surprise and concern was all the greater as I myself took part, as Danish Minister of Education at the time, in a Council meeting in 1974 during which we worked together on education in a very positive spirit. I was of course very glad to see that agreement was reached at the meeting on 27 June, but my question is whether the Commission is satisfied that the Danish Social Democratic Government will wholeheartedly and actively continue its participation in work on education, which many of

**Nielsen**

us in Denmark are proud to have initiated a long while ago, and which we were sad to see interrupted for so long by the Social Democratic Government's procrastination for internal political reasons. Is the Commission satisfied that the Danish Government has really had a change of heart, and it will now cooperate?

**Mr Jenkins.** — It is no part of my duty, nor is it my wish, to engage in Danish political disputes across the floor of this House. The fact of the matter is that Denmark subscribed to the agreement in substance, and this was a considerable advance on five fronts. There are certain procedural points to be cleared up, but we hope and believe that this can be done in the Committee of Permanent Representatives.

I think this Council does mark a major step forward in the educational field. Let us be thankful when we are able to do that even after a little delay.

**Mr Normanton.** — In the light of the totally misleading, if not mischievous, reports on the Council of Education Ministers' meeting — these reports appeared in the English press — would the President of the Commission have a careful look into the way in which preparations were made by the Commission and by those responsible for working with the media with a view to ensuring more effective liaison and making the media more accurately aware of what is being done?

**Mr Jenkins.** — I did see one or two highly misleading reports on this issue. This was a highly constructive initiative which was presented in one or two cases in a quite ridiculous fashion. As the honourable Member knows from his experience in this and other fields, the will is not always the father to the achievement so far as dealing with the media is concerned, and none of us wish to exercise excessive control. However, I shall bear in mind what he said and, where possible, we shall do everything in our power to guide them towards a more constructive, accurate and European attitude.

**Mr Megahy.** — Could I pursue this matter of procedure further by asking the President of the Commission whether he would agree that those procedural points still outstanding in themselves represent a very substantial obstacle to the achievement of the aims which have already been agreed, and, given his answer to the previous question about the role of the media, would he comment on the accuracy of reports in the British press to the effect that the Danish Government considered that an amendment of the Danish Constitution would be required before Denmark could agree to education measures. If in fact the reports are correct, and this claim was made, then it would seem to me that, despite agreement on certain measures, we

are a very long way away from making any progress in relation to education in the EEC.

**Mr Jenkins.** — I do not think that the reports in the British press to which the honourable Member was referring, and which I had noticed, had anything to do with the constitutional position in Denmark. What these reports were trying to suggest was that our proposals concerning a slightly more open approach in education, an improvement of language-teaching in the United Kingdom, a greater awareness of history as seen through eyes other than our own — very sensible ideas in part — amounted to some tremendous invasion of our national rights. I was not aware of any reports misrepresenting the Danish position. The Danish Government, as the honourable Member knows, has certain problems with Article 235. I do not wish to go into these at the present time. What I said was that a major step forward was taken in substance. The procedural difficulties remain in certain cases to be sorted out, but it is my hope and belief that these are not a major obstacle but a difficulty which, agreement in substance now having been reached, can with good will and good sense be overcome.

**Mr Bøgh.** — (Dk) I should like to put a supplementary to the original question, concerning as it does the Commission's activities in an area lying completely outside its competence.

What will the Commission do to protect a Member State against ceaseless and relentless attempts to impose new Community institutions which had no part in the concept of the Community which that country put to its voters, for the simple reason that the matters concerned are not covered by the European Community Treaties? And then I should like to know what is the hurry? What is stopping each country from making its own educational arrangements as it sees fit? I can tell you that our foreign language teaching facilities are not surpassed by many other Member States. But we did not come by them because we joined the Community. We shall retain them even if we leave the Community. They are there because we wish to prepare our young people and to equip them for later life. By the same token we teach European history, but without devoting special attention to the Community. I am quite sure that if you ever succeed in introducing compulsory EEC indoctrination into our schools it will be hated even more than when the catechism was rammed down our children's throats, destroying their enjoyment of school throughout most of Danish history.

**Mr Jenkins.** — There can be no question of the Commission or the Community forcing Member States. All that the Commission endeavours to do, which I am sure is in accordance with the general will of this House and, as approved in this meeting, in

**Jenkins**

accordance with the general will of the Council, is to try and make a little Community advance in a field in which there is certainly a genuine and understandable Community interest.

**Mrs Viehoff.** — (NL) We were informed in the Committee on Youth and Culture that there were no fundamental objections to the four points defined in 1976 and that there were also no financial difficulties, but that the Danish Government was objecting to certain other points. Can you tell me whether the situation has now changed in any way?

**Mr Jenkins.** — There has been agreement on five major points of substance and it is our belief that, agreement on substance having been reached unanimously, we shall be able to deal with the procedural questions.

**Mr van Aerssen.** — (D) Does the President of the Commission not believe that even if there is no specific provision in the Rome Treaties for an education policy, the Treaty objectives cannot be attained without broadly based coordination of education policy at Community level? Is the President of the Commission prepared to explain to our Danish friend, who said just now that this is a strictly national matter, how it can be possible to achieve freedom of establishment in the European Community unless at the same time educational certificates are recognized in all our countries and the language problem solved in one way or another?

**Mr Jenkins.** — I think that it is difficult to build a real Community without some progress in the educational field. As the House well knows, the Treaty of Rome was written some substantial time ago — 22 or 23 years ago now. It dealt with a number of provisions relating almost exclusively to the market and to the free market. However, there are certain other considerations. We must never consider asking a Member State to act outside the Treaty, but if we limit ourselves those issues which are explicitly laid down in the Treaty of Rome, then the Community will be a Community which lacks many of the attributes which we would all of us like to see. However, Member States have their sovereignty, they cannot be forced to do things, and decisions of this type are the prerogative of the governments concerned. But when we have made as much progress as we have made in this field recently, let us be thankful for the progress and let us hope it may continue.

**President.** — Question No 7 by Mr Newton-Dunn (H-104/80):

In his written answer to my oral question (H-19/80) Commissioner Gundelach stated that Member States

are now legally required to report to him on the 15th of each month details of all catches in the preceding month. Will he now confirm that all Member States are fulfilling their obligations in this respect — and will he now publish to the Parliament all details of catches since this system started operating on 15 February 1980?

**Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission.** — Although all Member States have now sent the Commission some information on landings of their own vessels, not all Member States have reported landings of other Member States' vessels. Only two Member States have respected the time-limits for sending the necessary information by the fifteenth of each month. The material received at this stage is therefore not sufficiently complete to warrant publication.

**Mr Newton Dunn.** — First of all what does the Commission intend to do to see that all Member States report these figures, as agreed and as required, as soon as possible? Secondly, the President of the Commission did not quite give an undertaking that the figures would be supplied to Parliament when they are received. Will he please do so?

**Mr Jenkins.** — We shall try to obtain this information from Member States by persuasive measures, certainly in the first instance, and we hope very much that these will be successful. The Regulation says that the Commission shall, on the 25th of each month, inform all Member States of the notifications received for the preceding months. There is not actually an obligation to inform Parliament, but we will publish this and Parliament will therefore be informed. We will certainly give what information we can. Our problem is the inadequacy of the information at the present time, not our lack of will to give it publicity.

**Mrs Ewing.** — As a step towards solving the problems the Commission has about the inadequacy of information, would the Commission review the suggestion I made in a speech on fishing some time ago to the effect that fishery inspection officers could, for instance, be exchanged between one Member State and another? It would do away with suspicion. It would make sure that fairness was exercised, and I feel that it would turn these inspection officers into protection officers.

**Mr Jenkins.** — The Commission will certainly look again at the suggestion made by the honourable Member in her speech, but I am not sure that it is suspicion of national inspection officers which is the root of the problem here. It is a certain dilatoriness on the part of the majority of the Member States. Reports are given with varying degrees of punctuality and fullness. By the end of June we had received full informa-

**Jenkins**

tion for May from Belgium and also from the United Kingdom. It had been received from Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands for April and Ireland for March, so there is a certain problem here. I do not think it is entirely suspicion; it is a question of getting Member States to be quicker in providing the information. In the great majority of cases it is not a question of refusing to do it, but of being dilatory. We will encourage them to be as prompt as possible.

**Mr Spicer.** — Even if the President resolves this problem of reporting on time, is there not a need in the longer term to ensure that the reporting is accurate? Has the Commission given any thought to a way in which spot checks might be carried out, and if not, why not?

**Mr Jenkins.** — You cannot decide whether a report is accurate until you have got a report. A non-existent report cannot be inaccurate. I suppose that may be regarded as one of its few virtues. However, let us have the reports anyway. I think that in the Community we must proceed to a significant extent upon the basis of trust. If we are going to believe that all the information we are given is inaccurate, we are going to have to have a very much larger Commission bureaucracy than we have at the moment. However, if any examples of inaccurate reporting are brought to my attention by the honourable Member or anybody else, we will consider what ought to be done.

**Mr Harris.** — Does the President share my view that there is extensive flouting of the present fishing controls? This was shown by the recent United Kingdom television film on how some Member States are turning a blind eye to landings of herring which apparently have been caught illegally. What assurances can the President give that if we do succeed in getting a common fisheries policy — and I for one want to see a common fisheries policy — there will be effective policing? Such a policy will certainly collapse if some fishermen have to keep the rules and other fishermen apparently get away with not keeping them.

**Mr Jenkins.** — It is, of course, easy to have accusation and counter-accusation, but clearly a common fisheries policy, which I very much hope we shall have in the near future and which is essential from a whole variety of points of view, must be based on accurate reporting and everybody observing the rules.

**President.** — Question No 8 by Mr Boyes (H-130/80):

Would the Commission detail the latest position in relation to Spanish Steel's proposals, published in 1979, to increase production capacity from 13.9 m. tonnes in 1978 to 18.6 m. tonnes in 1985?

**Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission.** — (F) I am able to inform the honourable Member that the decision concerning the Spanish steel production programme was cancelled by a royal decree of 21 March 1980. The reason for this cancellation was that the figures shown in the first programme for the Spanish steel industry no longer corresponded to the present situation of the European steel industry. Moreover, the Commission is in constant contact with the Spanish authorities on the subject of the steel industry with a view to ensuring that the restructuring of that industry is effected in coordination with that of our own steel industry.

**Mr Boyes.** — I was not exactly sure what Mr Davignon was saying there, but if he is saying that there is not going to be a reduction in Spanish steel production and that it is likely to stay at its present volume, then we would welcome that on behalf of the Spanish steel-workers. We would not want the same thing to happen to the Spanish steelworkers when they enter the Community as has happened to the steelworkers of France and the United Kingdom, and possibly Denmark, and Belgium, over the past few years. In fact, the Socialist Group had a visit to Germany last week, where we found the steel industry losing thousands of jobs too. It might suggest that the Commission's forecasting model, whichever one they are using, is not giving them the best possible forecast. Cutbacks are supposed to be an adjustment to world demands, but I would like to suggest to Mr Davignon — and I would like his comments on this — that steel demand is rising on a world scale and also that world overcapacity is likely to be overtaken by demand within the next few years. I would therefore like to know why it is that within the Community jobs are being lost and capacity is being reduced when the demand for steel seems to be on the upturn.

**Mr Davignon.** — (F) My answer was perfectly clear. Mr Boyes said in his question that the Spanish authorities intended to step up their steel production, on the basis of a decree, from 14 million tonnes to 18.5 million tonnes. I told him that this information was incorrect. Is that not sufficiently clear?

Secondly, steel consumption in the industrialized countries, i.e. those where we have better prospects for sales than elsewhere, is falling each year by a known percentage. It is believed that steel consumption in the United States will be some 20 % lower in 1980 than in 1979. We therefore note with real anxiety that steel consumption is declining in the industrialized countries, that it is slowly rising in the developing countries and that in the rest of the world it is growing less slowly than the gross national product and is more than covered by the production of the new Member States. This fact must be faced and it is important to determine Community measures to arrive at a remedy. As to the suggestion that these countries are experi-

**Davignon**

encing a crisis in their steel industry because of their membership of the Community the facts are so obviously contrary to this assertion that there seems no need for me to go into this any further.

**Mr Bonde.** — (DK) In the last few days the Danish newspapers have been reporting rumours that the Commission might ban subsidies to rescue the only Danish steel rolling mill, in Frederiksværk, which is crucial to employment in that town. Could the Commission confirm or deny the rumours? Needless to say we are hoping it will deny them.

**Mr Davignon.** — (F) I am able to confirm to the honourable Member that these rumours are totally without foundation and that the documents will be studied just as they are in all the other Community countries with a view to providing specific, practical aid to attain the known objectives. I am familiar with the situation of the steelworks to which he referred, where all the conditions exist for it to continue to operate without any problems.

**President.** — I call Mr Normanton on a point of order.

**Mr Normanton.** — Mr President, may I draw your attention to Rule 47B, and before you bring Question Time to its normal conclusion, may I give notice that I shall be asking you to apply Rule 47B as far as the request for a textile debate is concerned. May I have your undertaking that before you close this debate you will call me to exercise the right provided under Rule 47B?

**President.** — We shall consider the matter at the end of Question Time.

Question No 9 by Mr Patterson (H-245/80, formerly 0-16/80):

What action does the Commission plan to take in support of the International Year of the Disabled in 1981?

**Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (NL) The Commission does indeed consider that it must make a contribution to the International Year of the Handicapped in 1981. We have already embarked on a number of activities which are to be speeded up. We shall shortly be in a position to inform Parliament of the activities that we are preparing.

**Mr Patterson.** — May I thank the Commissioner for that not very informative answer. I would have liked to know what exactly the Commission was doing. But could I press him in one particular area, which is the

matter of children suffering from physical or mental handicap? Some time ago, the Commission issued a study 'Special education in the Community — developments and trends' called the Jürgenson report in which a very large number of sensible suggestions were made, both for the transition of young people from education to working life and on special provisions for the handicapped within the education system. May I ask what has happened to the 30 or 40 sensible recommendations in that report, which the Commission has promised to publish; and will a special effort be made in the International Year of the Disabled in the matter of handicapped children?

**Mr Vredeling.** — (NL) It is true that my answer was cryptic but I thought I was complying with the general wish of Parliament by giving a brief reply. But now I am being criticized for not answering at sufficient length.

In preparation for the International Year of the Handicapped we are in the first place preparing a special study, firstly on special measures by way of incentives and secondly on technical aids in the modern microelectronics sector which can often be of great benefit to the handicapped. We are also seeking mutual recognition between the Member States of parking facilities for the handicapped. Then we are looking into ways of making public means of transport, including aircraft, readily accessible to the handicapped, and finally we are reviewing statistical material on occupational training.

As regards the special question concerning measures for handicapped young children, I can only say that we have no authority whatever in this area. We are doing what we can for the handicapped, but the Social Fund rules even exclude financing of sheltered workplaces. I have already had occasion to express my dissatisfaction with this situation in Parliament. But the fact is that we can only give subsidies to projects for the handicapped if the projects relate to 'gainful employment' to use the English term. Everything else is beyond our authority.

**Mr Enright.** — Perhaps in fact you will rule that half of the answer to my question should be given by you yourself. However, I should like to ask the Commission if in fact it has plans to make access to Commission buildings much easier for the handicapped. Similarly can it exert some pressure upon Parliament to ensure that the buildings where it meets have adequate access for the handicapped?

**Mr Vredeling.** — (NL) In the Commission we employ a fairly high percentage of handicapped persons, certainly higher than the average, and we try to offer them the best possible facilities in our buildings. However, as you know, we are using existing

**Vredeling**

buildings that are rented by us. We do not have a complete say in the matter. The second part of your question was addressed to the President rather than to me.

**President.** — I do not feel that I can provide an answer now.

**Mr Hume.** — Could I make a positive suggestion to the Commissioner, which is contained in Question No 16, but which will not be reached? The suggestion, which really arises out of his own reply, is that he should look at the possibility of extending the existing criteria — or at least the interpretation of the criteria, for aid to the handicapped from the Social Fund? As the Commissioner understands, that aid is currently confined to training for open employment, and is very narrowly interpreted. Would the Commissioner not agree that all work for the rehabilitation of the handicapped is designed to enable them to lead more normal lives and therefore to prepare them for open employment? Could he not give a much more liberal interpretation to those criteria? I understand from his last reply that in fact he is in sympathy with what I am saying, and I am sure that he would have the sympathy and support of Parliament in giving a much wider and more liberal interpretation to those criteria.

**Mr Vredeling.** — (NL) I wish I could give a positive answer to the honourable Member's question. In 1979 applications were made for appropriations totalling 104 million EUA for the handicapped while we had only 61 million at our disposal. In 1980 applications totalled 125 million against the available 71.5 million. This means that we cannot apply the criteria as flexibly as we should like. That is out of the question. We have to apply strict rules. We have to limit our contributions and this may sometimes appear unjust. I fully agree with the honourable Member's point that in the case of sheltered workplaces aid for the handicapped should not be conditional on their performing economically profitable work. However, the basic Social Fund regulations would then have to be changed and that is not the subject of our debate today.

**Miss Brookes.** — Like my colleagues I was disappointed at the answers given by Commissioner Vredeling. They were very indecisive and disappointing. But Mr Vredeling, you have stated that you cannot help the handicapped and the mentally handicapped due to the present guidelines of the Social Fund. Will you therefore give an assurance that you will endeavour to broaden the guidelines of the Social Fund so that in future you can help the mentally handicapped? But within the terms of your present brief — particularly next year, the Year of the Disabled — can you use funds from the Social Fund for educational purposes to help members of the whole community to treat the

mentally handicapped as normal people who have lives of their own to live. Will you, Mr Commissioner, use funds available to you for educational and propaganda purposes to help people who are disabled? Will you use the word 'disabled' in its broadest possible sense to include the mentally handicapped, the blind and the deaf. If you wish to have statistics, Mr Commissioner, 10 babies out of every 100 are born with one handicap or another, in other words with one form of disablement or another. It may be deafness, it may be blindness, it may be a mental handicap, it may be spina bifida. That is the tremendous problem which people are facing, and I ask you to do all you can in 1981, the Year of the Disabled?

**Mr Vredeling.** — (NL) I want to remove one misunderstanding. I said that our funds are limited but all the categories mentioned by Mrs Brookes are eligible for support from the Social Fund. No one is better placed than I am to know this, Mrs Brookes. But I did make one reservation.

I am making the reservation that this can only be done in the case that after training leads to gainful employment; that is in the basic rules of the Social Fund, which I cannot change, nor can I change the guidelines. Because if I did so I would be called back by the Committee on Budgets that ensures that we spend the money in the right way. So, we do what we can and we help those categories that you mentioned, the blind, the deaf, the mentally handicapped also, but the criteria, which I do not like and would like to change, is that it should lead to gainful employment. That is one of the consequences that I mentioned before, Mr President: the onesidedness of this economic treaty.

**Mrs Hammerich.** — (DK) The Commission is accused of not having done enough yet in view of the impending International Year of the Disabled, but I do not feel that we should invariably be so critical and negative at its failure to make progress.

It is arguable that the Commission has already achieved something in advance of the Year of the Disabled. Each year the Member States are given guidelines for their economies, and if the Commission is dissatisfied we are told to exercise wage restraint and in particular to cut public expenditure. These cuts will soon take effect, and they will be cuts in social spending which will hit the weakest members of society hardest, and that includes the disabled. Thus the Commission's general economic policy will have indirect consequences for the disabled in my country too.

Does not the Commission see the contradiction between a general economic policy impoverishing welfare facilities on the one hand and on the other the isolated facilities for the disabled in air transport and car parks? Do they not seem derisory? And I should

**Hammerich**

also like to know, Mr Commissioner, whether care for the disabled does not actually lie outside the Commission's sphere of competence?

**Mr Vredeling.** — (NL) I cannot refute the honourable Member's remarks as far as the purport of her question is concerned. It is true that high priority is often given — and not always rightly — to the economic or monetary aspect instead of to social considerations. I can only agree with her.

**President.** — Question No 10 by Mr Romualdi (H-253/80, formerly O-21/80):

What security measures does the Commission intend to take to put a stop to the series of savage murders of Libyan refugees in the countries of the Community and to the activities of the hired assassins acting with the backing of the authorities of their country, following the threats made on various occasions by the Libyan Head of State, Colonel Gaddafi, whose intention it is in this way to eliminate all opposition to his regime and all dissidents?

**Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission.** — It is not within the power of the Commission to take security measures to protect the lives of Libyan refugees in the countries of the Community.

**President.** — Question No 11 by Mr Tyrrell (H-170/80):

Did the Commission, in relation to the butter for which tenders for export to Russia were considered on 30 April, propose a minimum selling price lower than the tender received, and if so, how was this price calculated?

**Mr Jenkins, President of the Commission.** — For the tender of 29 April offers were received for a total quantity of 20 900 tonnes at prices just above 110 ECU per hundred kilogrammes. The Commission, after obtaining the advice of the management committee, decided to fix the minimum selling price at 110 ECU per hundred kilogrammes, thereby accepting the offers. This intervention butter was at least a year old and, after taking account of quality deterioration and the cost of its further storage, we decided it was advantageous to us to proceed with the sale.

**Mr Tyrrell.** — Mr President, after that frank answer, with the acknowledgement by the Commission of responsibility for instigating the renewed sales of subsidized butter to Russia, could the Commission explain why it suspended export refunds on sales of butter to Russia in February, but has now reintroduced them in May?

**Mr Jenkins.** — This was not a question of export refunds, as the honourable Member, I think, knows. This tender, which was accepted at the end of April, concerned intervention butter which we had had in stock for over a year.

We have now abandoned the system of tenders for intervention butter and this was a commercial decision based on the fact, among other things, that intervention stocks of butter in the Community have been substantially reduced thanks to our successful management of the markets. We have taken the necessary administrative measures to ensure that exports of butter to the Soviet Union of whatever type do not exceed traditional levels, in fact no export certificates for butter to the Soviet Union have been issued since the end of May.

Now, as the Commission has made perfectly clear to the House on a number of occasions, the Commission has responsibility for managing this policy. It does not have responsibility for introducing a totally different political dimension into it from that which the Council has approved. The Council position is that we should not exceed traditional export levels, which average 75 000 tonnes for the last three years. The total export certificates to the Soviet Union for the first six months of this year are for 37 000 tonnes, 8 000 of which was in the first part of January before the introduction of special measures. This is within the limit and we have every intention of ensuring that the average for the traditional exports in the last three years, which I may say is less than half of the sales in 1979, will not be exceeded. That is the Commission's policy in a difficult position, as has made absolutely clear to this House in a number of debates and in replies to questions, and it is the policy to which the Commission will stick.

**Mr Hord.** — The President of the Commission has indicated that the Commission has now abandoned the open-tender system and I wonder why this has come about, because in the official reply to Mr Tyrrell it was stated that the offers for a recent tender were too low. I am surprised that the Commission has taken this decision to revert to the old system, bearing in mind that we had the most unsatisfactory situation with the French millionaire salesmen. Is the Commissioner now suggesting that it is to revert to these old, unacceptable practices?

**Mr Jenkins.** — No, what really has changed is that our successful management of the market — and this does not mean large sales to the Soviet Union, because I have given the figures and these are much less than last year — has enabled us to reduce our butter stocks quite substantially. Our exports to destinations other than the Soviet Union have been running at record levels and butter production in the Community in the first quarter of 1980 declined for the first time in many



**Jenkins**

years, while at the same time there has been a certain hardening of world market prices for dairy products. Against this background and not wishing to make further commitments against the 1980 budget, which has still not been finally adopted, we decided to reduce the level of restitutions for butter and to make certain other changes. But it does not affect our general policy which has been clearly stated by Vice-President Gundelach and myself on several occasions in the past.

**Mr Seligman.** — Many people in my country have been angry that butter was sold to the Russians at prices considerably lower than could be obtained even by schools and hospitals in our own country. I calculate that this 110 ECU per hundred kilogrammes works out at 31p per pound which is now the same price as schools can buy it at in England. Am I right in that calculation, am I right in saying we have now got it on an equal basis?

**Mr Jenkins.** — I think — although I would like to check this and communicate with the honourable Member — that he is probably approximately right. Certainly this sale of old butter, which accounts for over half the sales to the Soviet Union during the past half year, and which was costing us 36 ECU per hundred kilogrammes to keep in stock was, in our view, a sale which was advantageous to the Community, which is why we did it, and not to the Soviet Union.

**Mr Harris.** — Although I accept what the President of the Commission said about the decisions of the Council, does the President of the Commission feel that in his position he can ignore totally the political consequences of these sales, and does he accept that there is resentment, not just in the United Kingdom, but in other countries as well over these sales, and that really those political considerations are far more important than the commercial ones?

**Mr Jenkins.** — I do accept that there are political considerations here, but I also believe that the Commission, while having a certain amount of scope for important management decisions, has to work with the Council in this matter. I have found this, as I think the honourable Member and the House knows, one of the most difficult issues with which we have had to deal in the first six months of this year. The honourable Member knows that there are differing views in this House and one knows the quarter, which I respect very much, from which the questions tend to come. There are not unanimous views in this House, but I have certainly endeavoured to take fully into account views which have been expressed and, insofar as is reasonable for the Commission, the political consequences. I think, in view of all the difficulties, the course we have steered, while being far from perfect, could have been a good deal worse than it has been.

**President.** — I call Mr Normanton who has indicated that he wishes to make a proposal.

**Mr Normanton.** — Mr President, may I thank you for giving me the opportunity to submit a formal request under Rule 47B for a debate on the EEC textile industry. Under this rule, as you will no doubt have checked, any 5 Members may submit a request for a debate — we used to call it an actuality debate — where it was felt that the matter was one of general and particular topical interest, and particularly where the replies of the Commission were regarded as inadequate to meet the urgency of the situation. I know, Mr President, that it would be administratively inconvenient for a debate to take place strictly in accordance with Rule 47B, which says that it should be held immediately after Question Time. It may well be difficult to hold a debate now since the agenda is already heavily loaded for the whole of this week's part-session, but I know I would be expressing the views of at least 9 Members who have given me their names in support of this request if I asked you to give an assurance that this debate will be held over until the September part-session. I would earnestly hope, Mr President, that you will look favourably on this request, and though it may not be in your competence as the chairman of this session to give a firm undertaking, I hope that Madam Veil will in fact and do all she can to ensure that a debate on the European Economic Community textile industry and its difficulties is placed on the agenda for the September part-session.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — I should like to thank Mr Normanton for being so understanding. Clearly at this late hour and with the number of items still on the agenda there is no question of improvising a debate on a matter of this importance. However, I am more than willing to submit this proposal to the Bureau with the recommendation that it be adopted.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the centre and on the right).*

Question time is closed.

#### 18. *Development of an air-traffic control system*

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-274/80) by Mr Janssen van Raay, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the development of a coordinated European air traffic control system (Doc. 1-554/79).

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, I should just like an explanation. It is now 7.45. I am informed that

<sup>1</sup> see Annex

**Pannella**

twelve speakers have put their names down for the debate following the statement by the rapporteur. What procedure is the Presidency intending to follow? When shall we be continuing our debate?

As far as I am concerned, Mr President, I should gladly waive my right to speak because of the importance of arriving at a conclusion, but if I do not speak the amendments which I have tabled will lapse. I shall therefore speak very briefly.

**President.** — We shall clearly not be able to finish the debate this evening. It will therefore be continued on Thursday.

I call Mr Moreland.

**Mr Moreland.** — Mr President, the reason for holding this debate today is that the ministers responsible for this subject are meeting tomorrow. Since there is no point in holding it on Thursday, it is essential that if we cannot complete it tonight we continue it first thing tomorrow.

**President.** — The matter will be put to the Bureau.

I call Mr Moorhouse.

**Mr Moorhouse.** — Mr President, it is not often that I find myself in agreement with Mr Pannella, but I would urge that sufficient time be reserved for a debate on this extremely important subject of Eurocontrol which affects every single Member of this House. You indicated in your preliminary reply that you intend to continue the debate on Thursday. May I however ask whether you could reconsider your decision and continue the debate tomorrow morning, which would in many ways seem far preferable.

**President.** — I call Mr Seefeld.

**Mr Seefeld.** — (D) Mr President, in my capacity as chairman of the Committee on Transport, I wish to emphasize the importance of the whole problem of air traffic safety in Europe. The committee has taken great pains; it had hoped that a decision could be reached today because the Ministers are due to meet tomorrow and may take decisions which this Assembly does not want. The Committee on Transport was unanimous. If a particular Member now feels that he must table a large number of amendments, he is of course perfectly entitled to do so but I regret the fact greatly because our unanimity may be impaired if we cannot take the vote in good time.

Mr President, I appeal to you at the very least to see to it that our debate is continued tomorrow morning to enable us to bring the views of the major political groups in Parliament to the attention of the Ministers who are meeting tomorrow; this matter is important to

Eurocontrol since Eurocontrol must survive! And our Assembly must express a positive opinion here!

*(Applause in various parts of the House)*

**President.** — I fully understand, Mr Seefeld, your reaction and your concern. I, too, feel that it is very regrettable that a topic as important as air safety cannot be dealt with in such a way as to enable us to arrive at conclusions.

Unfortunately, we are bound by limits which we cannot exceed. The order of business for this sitting, which was adopted by Parliament, stipulates that tomorrow morning will be devoted to the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council. The agenda cannot, therefore, be amended.

I call Mr Berkhouwer.

**Mr Berkhouwer.** — (NL) May I make a useful suggestion, Mr President. The responsible Council of Ministers is to meet tomorrow and we are unfortunately due to continue this debate on Thursday. Could you not put the following question to the House: might we not reach unanimous agreement to send a telegram, in our capacity as Members of Parliament, this evening, requesting the Council at its meeting tomorrow in Brussels not to reach any decisions before our Parliament has delivered its opinion? I think that with good will in this House, this should be possible. But I already see Mr Pannella is objecting...

**President.** — Thank you for your suggestion, Mr Berkhouwer, which I shall forward to the President. I cannot make any commitments in this regard, but the President may inform the Council of Ministers that, for reasons outside her control, Parliament has not been able to debate or vote on the question.

I call Mr Janssen van Raay.

**Mr Janssen van Raay, Rapporteur** — (NL) Mr President, first a procedural point. If the whole debate is to be held over to Thursday, I think it would be preferable for me also to give my introductory statement on Thursday. I shall need twenty minutes for that. I strongly support Mr Berkhouwer's suggestion. Let us put this to the vote. The draft report was unanimously approved by the Committee on Transport. It is therefore reasonable to expect Parliament to endorse this suggestion: we can now concentrate on the text of the telegram. I should prefer to begin my introductory statement when all the speakers are present so that they can listen to me and I in my turn hear what they have to say. We could then hold a short debate on this subject. I fully agree therefore with the practical proposal made by Mr Berkhouwer.

As a directly elected Parliament we should be able to obtain respect from the Council for our position. And I should prefer to begin my introductory statement when we have time for the proper debate.

**President.** — I call Mr Cottrell.

**Mr Cottrell.** — I was really going to agree with Mr Berkhouwer's idea, but, just to add one other comment, how dead is our deadline? May we continue for the relatively few minutes beyond eight o'clock which we need to complete the debate on this very important subject?

**President.** — We have exactly six minutes left!

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, it is not for me to discuss Mr Berkhouwer's style. I want to say quite simply that I agree fully to action of the kind he has proposed. However, Mr Berkhouwer was a President of this Parliament — although of course under different conditions — and he knows perfectly well that we can put a resolution to the vote but not a telegram. I think then that, unless it can be proved to the contrary, the President would be expressing our unanimous views by sending a telegram on the lines indicated by Mr Berkhouwer. I hope that the President will do so but we cannot take a vote on a telegram.

A further point, Mr President: it is sufficient for ten of us to move an amendment to the agenda to enable this item to be debated tomorrow. In that case I shall waive most of my amendments because I agree completely on the urgency and substance of the report and believe that a telegram should be sent this evening and that tomorrow we should be in a position to inform the Council of the conclusion of our debate.

If the debate is held tomorrow, we shall withdraw most of our amendments. I therefore propose that ten of us should ask at this stage for a debate to be held, if only very briefly, tomorrow before or after the debate on the programme of the Luxembourg Presidency to enable us to take a vote and arrive at a conclusion. In that case, I repeat, most of my amendments will be withdrawn.

**President.** — I call Mr Herman.

**Mr Herman.** — (F) I have another suggestion to put to you and the Assembly, a suggestion which takes account of the fact that this report was adopted by a very large majority, if not unanimously, by the Committee on Transport. Since the Council of Ministers is meeting tomorrow, it is urgent for it to be acquainted with the opinion of Parliament. My proposal is therefore that we adopt this report without debate. We can vote on the amendments tomorrow or at the next voting time, but we can close the debate. That would enable us to inform the Council very rapidly and at the same time — since a broad unanimity prevailed in the Committee — to advance our work as rapidly as possible without having to debate this matter again on Thursday.

**President.** — I call Mr Cardia.

**Mr Cardia.** — (I) Mr President, I do not think it possible to accept at this stage in our sitting the proposal made by the previous speaker because a vote of this kind would deprive Parliament's decision of all weight. I think the only path open to us is to follow the suggestion agreed to by many of our colleagues: the President should make use of his authority to request the Council which will be meeting tomorrow not to take a decision — especially a decision running counter to the motion for a resolution drafted by our committee — until this Assembly has debated and voted on the document now before it.

**President.** — I have noted with interest the various suggestions put forward.

Mr Herman I must say that I do not see how we could adopt a report of such importance without debate, without hearing the rapporteur, without allowing other Members to express their views and without the amendments which might be tabled and possibly adopted. Despite their importance committee reports they alone cannot take the place of debate and vote in plenary sitting. I cannot therefore accept this suggestion.

I should like to assure Mr Pannella that I have never for a moment considered asking the House to vote on a telegram. The only possible course of action — the decision does not rest with me — would be for the President, if she considers it appropriate, to inform the Council tomorrow of the state of the question, perhaps communicate to it unofficially and purely for the sake of documentation the text of the committee's report so as to provide information for government representatives at the meeting. As I am only Vice-President I can do no more than pass on this suggestion.

Are there any objections to Mr Janssen van Raay's request?

That is agreed.

#### 19. Agenda for next sitting

**President.** — The next sitting will take place tomorrow, Tuesday, 8 July 1980, at 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. with the following agenda:

- Decision on request for urgent debate
- Council statement on the programme of the Luxembourg presidency, followed by a debate
- Luster report on the amendment of Parliament's Rules of Procedure (debate)

5.30 p.m. until 7 p.m.: Question time (questions to the Council and to the Foreign Ministers)

The sitting is closed.

(The sitting was closed at 8 p.m.)

## ANNEX

*Action taken by the Commission on opinions of the European Parliament adopted during the June 1980 part-session*

1. As agreed with the Bureau, the Commission informs Members at the beginning of every part-session of the action it has taken on opinions delivered at the previous part-session.
2. At its June part-session, the European Parliament delivered 20 opinions in response to Council requests for consultation.
3. At its June part-session, Parliament debated the following 15 reports which received favourable opinions or did not give rise to requests for formal amendments:
  - Report by Mr Muntingh on a proposal relating to the conclusion of the convention on the conservation of European wild life and natural habitats
  - Report by Mr Caillavet on a proposal for the common organization of the market in processed fruit and vegetable products
  - Report by Mr Dalsass on a proposal for the common organization of the market in wine
  - Report by Mr Buchou on three proposals relating to the conclusion of the Fisheries Agreement with Spain and to measures for the management of fishery resources applicable to vessels flying the Spanish or Canadian flags
  - Report by Mr Kirk on temporary joint measures for the restructuring of the inshore fishing industry
  - Report by Mr Lynge on three proposals on measures relating to the management of fishery resources and applicable to Faroese, Norwegian and Swedish vessels
  - Report by Mr Davern on a proposal fixing the amount of aid for the hop sector in respect of the 1979 harvest
  - Report by Mr Buchou on the eradication of African swine fever in Portugal
  - Report by Mr Buchou on six proposals for measures to combat classical swine fever
  - Proposal for a directive concerning the performance of heating equipment used to heat premises and produce hot water
  - Report by Mr Ligios on the beef and veal sector
  - Report by Mr Louwes on two proposals concerning tariff quotas for cows and bulls
  - Report by Mr Radoux on the protective measures provided for in the Agreement with Yugoslavia
  - Report by Mr Johnson on fruit juices and certain similar products
  - Report by Mr Remilly on the marketing and use of certain dangerous substances and preparations
4. Parliament proposed the amendment of Commission proposals in five cases and in four of these cases the Commission agreed to such amendment:
  - Report by Mrs Feuillet on two proposals concerning alkaline chlorides in the aquatic environment
  - The Commission is preparing an amended proposal which will be forwarded to the Council and Parliament in September.
  - Report by Mr Mertens on the discharge of aldrin into the aquatic environment
  - The Commission is preparing an amended proposal which will be forwarded to the Council and Parliament in September.
  - Report by Mr Roudy on a directive concerning the major accident hazards of certain industrial activities
  - The Commission is preparing an amended proposal which will be forwarded to the Council and Parliament in September.
  - Report by Mr Jurgens on a regulation on the common organization of the market in oils and fats
  - The Commission is preparing an amended proposal which will shortly be forwarded to the Council and Parliament

In the case of Mrs Schleicher's report on the approximation of Member States' legislation on cosmetic products, The Commission explained its reasons for wishing to leave the proposal as it stood.

*Questions which could not be answered during Question Time, with written answers*

*Question No 12, by Mr Remilly (H-179/80)*

Subject: Harmonization of speed limits in Europe

Does the Commission intend to propose harmonization of the speed limits on road and motorways in the nine Community countries?

*Answer*

No. The Commission feels that there are more pressing problems in the transport field than speed limits and that it can take more constructive and effective measures than that suggested by the honourable Member.

*Question No 13, by Mr Adam (H-198/80)*

Subject: Information policy

Bearing in mind the importance of full information, will the Commission undertake to widen the contact of visiting journalists with other institutions of the Community to ensure contact with the Parliament's members and in particular members participating in meetings in Brussels?

*Answer*

When the Commission's information service prepares programmes for journalists visiting Brussels for general briefings, it normally contacts the Parliament's information services to arrange for the Parliament's own staff to give a briefing on the Parliament. Similar contacts are made, albeit less frequently with other institutions and with the Economic and Social Committee.

Whilst the Commission would welcome the participation of members of the Parliament in these programmes, its information service is not in a position to undertake the necessary contacts with individual members.

*Question No 14, by Mrs Lizin (H-199/80)*

Subject: Allocation of responsibilities within the new Commission

Does not the Commission consider that to give a single Commissioner responsibility for both energy policy and nuclear safety, areas which may often have conflicting aims, will have an inhibiting effect, and that there is good reason to separate the two areas of responsibility?

*Answer*

Since the Commission has collegiate responsibility for all questions within its competence, the allocation of portfolios is a matter of administrative convenience.

Under the present Commission, energy policy and nuclear safety are the separate responsibilities of Mr Brunner and of Mr Natali respectively. As to the allocation of responsibilities within the new Commission, that is not a matter for the present Commission.

*Question No 15, by Mr Hord (H-206/80)*

Subject: Sales to Iran

Will the Commission confirm that sales of surplus Community agricultural commodities have recently been made to Iran and if so would the Commission indicate the commodities concerned, the quantities involved, the dates of the transactions and the amount of the EEC subsidy given?

*Answer*

Together with other third countries, Iran has for a long time been quite an important market for Community agricultural exports. The relevant statistics will be provided by the Commission in reply to Written Question No 408/80 by Mr Dankert. These statistics show that a wide range of products are exported, mainly sugar, dairy products and processed foodstuffs. As in the case of other countries, exporters may, where Community rules allow, be paid export refunds in order to make the Community product more competitive on the world market.

Community statistics are not yet available for the first few months of 1980; it is therefore too early to draw conclusions concerning the development of trade. However export-trends, particularly of dairy products and sugar, appear to be consistent with recent years. It should be pointed out that the embargo decided upon by the USA and the Community does not apply to pharmaceutical products or foodstuffs.

*Question No 16, by Mr Hume (H-214/80)*

Subject: Social Fund aid

Is the Commission prepared to widen the criteria for aid to the handicapped under the Social Fund?

*Answer*

The need for selection criteria arises from the fact that in recent years the Social Fund resources have been totally insufficient to meet all requests for aid. If this situation continues, there would be no justification for amending the directives.

The Commission considers that the present directives provide a well-balanced and objective basis for the selection of applications while taking due account of the situation in areas requiring extra aid for vocational training for the disabled.

*Question No 17, by Mr Welsh (H-227/80)*

Subject: Letter to the Commission of 22 March

When does the Commission intend to answer my letter of 22 March addressed to Commissioner Vouel in connection with his answer to Oral Question H-286/79<sup>1</sup> by Mr Pininfarina?

*Answer*

I am in a position to inform Parliament that Mr Vouel has replied by letter of 22 June 1980 to the letter from the honourable Member.

*Question No 18, by Mr Moreland (H-233/80): held over*

*Question No 19, by Mr Ansquer (H-234/80)*

Subject: Competition from imports of chemicals from the East

What does the Commission intend to do to put an end to the permanent threat facing our industries in the form of large scale imports of chemicals from the East?

*Answer*

Where trade in chemical products between East European countries and the Community are concerned it is incorrect to speak of 'the permanent threat in the form of large scale imports of chemicals'.

Such a threat does not exist.

The figures at the Commission's disposal indicate that trade in chemical products between the two regions showed a positive and stable net balance in favour of the Community in 1978 and 1979.

On the other hand a problem exists with regard to the exportation price policy practices by East European countries which, as our experience of trade defence has shown has meant that the majority of chemical anti-dumping cases have involved imports from East European countries.

For the moment our trade defence system has been able to keep this phenomenon under control.

*Question No 20, by Mr Buchou (H-235/80)*

Subject: Unsatisfactory level of increase in agricultural prices

Does the Commission not consider that the increase in agricultural prices agreed on recently by the Council is insufficient to cover agricultural costs and does it not think it necessary to envisage an additional increase before the start of the 1980/81 marketing year?

<sup>1</sup> Debates of the European Parliament, No 251, p. 23.

*Answer*

Considering all the factors affecting the agricultural price fixing for the 1980/81 campaign (costs of production, agricultural income, market balance, consumption, budgetary cost) the Commission considers that a reasonable compromise was reached.

*Question No 21, by Mr Deleau (H-236/80)*

Subject: Community-level policy on energy prices

Does the Commission think it would be possible to pursue a policy on energy prices at Community level? Could such a policy be combined with suitable incentives in order to resolve short-term difficulties?

*Answer*

Yes. Harmonization of energy prices is a possibility only in the very long term, but the Commission believes that if the energy objectives agreed at the Venice Summit meetings are to be achieved there is an urgent need for agreement, both within the Community and with our industrial partners, on the principles that should govern energy pricing. Consumer prices must reflect conditions on the world market, which will in the long term be determined by the cost of replacing and developing energy resources. The Council — Energy — adopted a resolution endorsing these principles at its meeting on 13 May 1980, and the Commission is preparing proposals to ensure that this agreement is translated into effective action.

Rational energy pricing is, in our view, a necessary condition for the realization of the extra investment needed to liberate our economies from dependence on imported oil. But there is also a need for a greatly enlarged programme of public support for investment in energy, especially in energy saving, and we believe that the Community has a role to play in developing such a programme. Our proposals for the development of energy policy in this way are contained in a Communication to the European Council dated 20 March 1980, and in a series of four supporting papers, whose general conclusions were endorsed by the European Council at its meeting in Luxembourg. Work is in hand in the Commission and in the Council, both Energy and Economic and Financial Affairs on the elaboration of these.

*Question No 22, by Mr Provan (H-238/80)*

Subject: Scottish raspberry growers

Will the Commission take steps to assist the Scottish raspberry growers, who last year and most probably this year, will be facing severe competition from raspberry products imported from Eastern Europe? These imports are coming in at prices far below those that Member nations can compete with and would the Commission agree that it is for the long-term benefit of the Community that we produce our own raspberries?

*Answer*

The information available to the Commission points to steady imports of raspberry pulp from third countries, particularly from Eastern Europe.

However, in order to obtain a clearer picture of the market in these products, the Commission has requested Member States to provide additional information on home production and imports. It will not fail to take any necessary steps to protect Community production.

*Question No 23, by Mrs Le Roux (H-240/80)*

Subject: Dumping of new potatoes by Greece and Spain on the Community market

Greece and Spain have granted subsidies on exports of new potatoes to the Community countries. In addition, the Greek Government has guaranteed its producers a price of FF 0.83 per kilo until 31 July. Since the Commission is responsible for monitoring imports of agricultural products into the Community, why has it not reacted to this development? Would it not agree that measures are urgently needed to put a stop to such unfair competition?

*Answer*

The Commission continually monitors developments in the Community market in new potatoes, particularly where price levels and trade patterns are concerned. It is ready to intervene in line with

the Community's international obligations whenever developments threaten to upset the market balance. In the absence of a common organization of the market and of the common trade policy for this product — except in the case of the Greece, Malta and Cyprus — France and the United Kingdom have taken rigorous measures to curtail imports from Spain. The Commission does not have enough information to initiate an investigation of the charge against Spain of subsidizing its exports to the EEC. In the case of Greece the Commission has made urgent representations to the Greek authority at a high level which have led to the total abolition of export refunds with effect from 14 June 1980.

*Question No 24, by Mr van Aerssen (H-244/80)*

Subject: Review of the OECD export credit system

Is the Commission prepared to cooperate on an early and thorough review of the OECD agreement on export credit, with a view to reducing government export subsidies and at the risk of distortions of competition?

*Answer*

Not only is the Commission prepared to cooperate in improving the agreement on export credit subsidized from public funds; it is actively engaged in so doing.

Since the Agreement came into force on 1 April 1978 the Commission has on two occasions drawn up proposals for the Council aimed at adapting the existing provisions. Recently, in May, it took part in a meeting of signatories to the Agreement and, on behalf of the Community, put forward a body of proposals on the adaptation of the various provisions of the Agreement including interest rates. These negotiations between those involved in the agreement are due to continue in autumn with a view to finding an overall solution acceptable to all.

The Commission has submitted to the Council a draft negotiation directive which would allow it to negotiate an improvement in the arrangement. This proposal is being examined by the appropriate Council body.

*Question No 26, by Sir Peter Vanneck (H-257/80)*

Subject: Sale of home-made food and preserves for charitable purposes

With reference to the 1955 British Food and Drugs Act, which forbids the sale of home-made jams and preserves unless the home kitchen is inspected and licensed, can the Commission confirm that this sort of *de minimis* legislation neither exists in the other Member States nor is encouraged by the Commission?

*Answer*

Section 16 of the UK Food and Drugs Act, to which the honourable Member refers, stipulates that only officially approved premises may be used for the preparation or manufacture of foodstuffs for marketing, whether tinned or pickled in vinegar or brine.

Similar rules on the health requirements for premises on which foodstuffs are prepared or manufactured exist in three Member States (UK, Denmark, Ireland). The legislation of the Member States on whose territory foodstuffs are sold applies to the manufacture, composition and conditions of sale, whether they are produced on an industrial or non-industrial basis.

Such provisions ensure equal conditions of competition and the protection of consumers.

*Question No 27, by Mr Cottrell (H-261/80)*

Subject: Experiments on animals

Is the Commission aware of the disgust felt throughout Europe concerning the practice of experiments upon animals in connection with the cosmetics industry? Does the Commission believe that the opportunity should now be taken to establish a Code of Conduct for the European Community concerning the whole field of experimentation involving animals and will the Commission give an assurance that research and development funds in this area are apportioned only with strict regard to essential experimentation of a medical nature and that this work is carefully monitored to ensure essential humanitarian values?



*Answer*

1. The Commission is aware of the protests caused by certain experiments on animals. It has, moreover, recently stated its position in answer to Written Question No 85/80 by Mrs Vays-sade on vivisection.
2. Experiments on animals cannot be stopped without serious risks to human health. However, only essential experiments should be carried out and ethical principles must be respected.
3. In the Council of Europe the Commission is helping to draft a Convention on the use of live animals for experimental purposes, which should provide the code of conduct desired by the honourable Member.
4. In considering projects involving experiments on animals, the Commission ensures that basic humanitarian principles are respected.

*Question No 28, by Mrs Cresson (H-22/80)*

Subject: Information on Regional Fund projects

Can the Commission reaffirm its claim in response to my Written Question No 1692/79<sup>1</sup>) that it respects the wishes of some Member States which prefer the precise location of Regional Fund projects not to be indicated, and could it say which Member States they are and why they want to keep the location of ERDF projects secret when Members of the European Parliament and the public have a right to such information?

*Answer*

1. As the Commission has already stated, in particular in its annual reports on the activity of the Regional Fund and in answer to Oral Question No H-188/80<sup>1</sup>), it attaches great importance to information on the activities of the ERDF.

The main types of information are:

- the publication of projects receiving aid in the Official Journal of the European Communities
  - press releases
  - notice boards
  - information obtained directly from investors.
2. Such information must, however, comply with the provisions of the Regulation on the Fund,<sup>2</sup> in particular Article 10. It must also take account of the type of project for which aid is given, distinguishing between industrial, craft, service or infrastructural investment programmes.
  3. The regulation on the European Regional Development Fund allows assistance from the Fund to be given in order to supplement aid granted by Member States for the purposes of regional development and as a partial reimbursement of national aid already given. The national authorities apportion aid to individual projects, which they then submit to the Commission as a basis for calculating the amount to be paid from the Fund to the Member State. While a description of such projects can of course be given, it is not always possible to specify which investor finally receives the funds. At present the investor does not, in fact, receive Community funds directly, since reimbursement is made on an overall basis.
  4. For this reason, as far as industrial investment is concerned, the publication of the exact location of projects receiving ERDF aid is not as informative as it might be, since all of the Member States avail themselves of the option offered by the Fund Regulation to use aid from the Fund as a reimbursement of their own national aid. To inform investors that their project has received aid partly financed by the Community might lead to confusion since this in no way increases the total amount of aid granted to the undertaking.
  5. For larger infrastructural projects receiving aid from the Fund the information must be posted on the appropriate notice boards, and the Commission requests the honourable Member to refer to the answer to Oral Question No H-100/80. The reluctance of certain Member States, in particular the Federal Republic of Germany and France, to publish the exact location of infrastructural projects especially those involving amounts lower than 10 m EUA, stems from the fact that Community aid does not necessarily supplement national expenditure in each case and that there is not always a direct payment from the Community to investors.

1 See OJ No C 126 of 27. 5. 1980, p. 83.

2 See Council Regulation (EEC) No 724/75 of 18 March 1975, amended by Regulation (EEC) No 213/79.

6. For this reason the lists at present published in the Official Journal cannot provide all the information required. The Commission also draws the attention of the honourable Member to the fact that information published in the Official Journal of the European Communities follows a standard pattern. In view of the importance attached by the Commission to information on the Fund's activities, it intends to continue its efforts to improve gradually the information officially published and to make full use of the other available methods of obtaining and providing information.

*Question No 29, by Mrs Squarcialupi (H-266/80): held over.*

*Question No 30, by Mr Paisely (H-267/80)*

Subject: Northern Ireland's unemployment

As Northern Ireland's unemployment is about double the EEC and UK average, and the high cost of feedstuffs is a substantial handicap to the pig and poultry sections of agriculture, and as 5 000 or more jobs are at stake, would the Commission consider extending the same arrangement which assists Italy on grain prices to Northern Ireland in order to save this vital section of agriculture?

*Answer*

On 12 June 1980 the Commission submitted to the Council a proposal for a Community measure to improve the processing and sale of pigmeat, eggs, poultrymeat, cereals and cattle fodder in Northern Ireland. The objective of this measure, for which a financial contribution of 12 million EUA from the Community is envisaged, is to remove the underlying causes of the problems arising in connection with these products. In the Commission's opinion this will provide the most effective long-term guarantee of employment in agriculture.

*Question No 31, by Mr Moorhouse (H-268/80)*

Subject: Community shipping by the dumping of freight services by Comecon countries

In view of the increasingly serious threat posed to Community shipping by the dumping of freight services by Comecon countries, what proposals will the Commission now make to bring about a Community response, particularly with regard to the possible introduction of a quota system and what is the Commission's estimate of the impact with the Trans-Siberian Land Bridge will make over the next few years to Community freight concerns' share of contracts generated by trade between Western Europe and The Far East?

*Answer*

The Community is monitoring the activities of liner operators in two shipping trades. The results are coming in and the Commission proposes to make a report on these, together with proposals for follow-up action, taking into account the termination of the present monitoring system on 31 December 1980.

As far as counter-measures are concerned, the Commission has been studying Member State's own legislation and takes the view that a quota system would be a possibility.

The Commission is concerned about the implications for Community shipping of the development of the Trans-Siberian railway and is considering making a more detailed study of the railway and those implications.

*Question No 32, by Mr O'Donnell (H-269/80)*

Subject: The Gaeltacht (Irish Speaking Regions) of Ireland

Is the Commission aware of the special cultural significance of the Gaeltacht regions of Ireland, and of the serious economic and social disadvantages from which these regions suffer, and, if so, whether the Commission would be willing to cooperate with and assist the newly established Gaeltacht Authority — Udarás na Gaeltachta, in formulating and implementing a comprehensive, integrated development programme for the Gaeltacht.

*Answer*

The Commission is aware of the distinguishing cultural features of the Gaeltacht districts and of the fairly low level of their economic and social development.

It is fully prepared to cooperate with the Irish authorities, at their request, in considering any proposals for integrated development programmes to assist the Gaeltacht districts and any other less-developed areas in Ireland, and to seek to make better use of the financial facilities available vis. The ERDF, the EAGGF, the Social Fund and EMS interest subsidies on NCI loans.

*Question No 33, by Mrs Desmond (H-273/80)*

Subject: ECSC housing schemes in Ireland

Can the Commission state what changes have been made recently relating to ECSC housing schemes in Ireland, particularly concerning (a) total amounts payable and (b) application and assessment procedures, and also whether these changes had the approval of the Irish Government?

*Answer*

The Commission has already indicated to those concerned that it is willing to introduce certain changes in the operation of the ECSC housing scheme, including the increase in the maximum amount of each individual loan from £3 000 to £4 500 and the extension of the scheme to house purchase as well as house construction. These changes will apply to future loans approved by the Commission and follow close consultation with the Irish Department for the Environment, which has been active in making the case for a higher maximum, given the exceptional increases both in the cost of housing in the Cobh area and the rate of interest on borrowing generally.

*Question No 34, by Mrs Martin (H-274/80): held over**Question No 35, by Mr Christopher Jackson (H-275/80)*

Subject: Type Approval Number

In the UK all vehicles manufactured after August 1978 require a 'Type Approval Number' before they can be registered and given a number plate. In practice, because of the technical nature of the information required, Primary Type Approval Numbers are restricted to manufacturers. There is evidence that in the UK importers of cars assembled in other Community countries have been denied access to Type Approval Numbers, and thus denied registration, where cars have been converted by the importer to left-hand drive, although all duties and taxes have been paid and the vehicles conform to all required safety regulations. Does the Commission consider that this restriction of access to Type Approval Numbers contravenes the Treaty of Rome thus curbing competition, because it is a hindrance to the free movement of goods between Community countries, and will the Commission consider taking measures to ensure competition is maintained.

*Answer*

The honourable Member is referring to the type-approval procedure for vehicles prior to registration.

It is true that only manufacturers may request type-approval. However, according to the rules applying in the United Kingdom, anyone, including the importer, may request individual approval (Ministers Approval Certificate) for any vehicle — which, on receipt of the approval certificate, may be registered. The vehicles must conform to the safety standards.

If the approval certificate is not granted, according to UK rules, an appeal may be made. If the UK authorities withhold approval for imported vehicles without due cause, they may find that they are infringing the provisions of the Treaty.

The available information is, as yet, insufficient to ascertain whether this is in fact the case. If the honourable Member wishes the Commission to enquire further into the matter, I suggest that he provide my staff with the fullest documentation possible; after the matter has been given due consideration, the Commission could then make representations to the UK authorities if necessary.

*Question No 36, by Mrs Clwyd (H-277/80)*

Subject: Contravention of Code of Conduct on South Africa, relating to minimum wage level

What is the Commission's view of recent allegations that at least 20 % of African workers employed by British companies in South Africa are paid below the minimum level recommended by the EEC Code of Conduct and will the Commission ensure that a full list of those companies contravening the spirit of the Code of Conduct be made public?

*Answer*

1. The Code of Conduct for undertakings with subsidiaries, branches or agencies in South Africa is the result of concerted action by Member States in political cooperation. The Commission is present when the Foreign Ministers meet in political cooperation but it has not been given the responsibility of monitoring the Code and is therefore unable to provide a list of undertakings which infringe its provisions.
2. The Commission would like to see the Member States persevere in their efforts to ensure that the Code is complied with as widely as possible and welcomes the cooperation and the support of the European Parliament in this respect.

*Question No 37, by Mr Debré (H-281/80)*

Subject: Turkish exports of industrial goods

Given the potentially harmful effects on the European textile industry, and the French textile industry in particular, of any failure to take all possible steps to ensure that our markets are open to imports under conditions which allow our manufacturers to compete on an equal footing, does the Commission really believe that this is the right moment to remove all restrictions and obstacles to imports of industrial goods from Turkey?

*Answer*

The Additional Protocol concluded in 1973 as part of the EEC/Turkey Association set up by the Ankara Agreement has eliminated all restrictions or obstacles to Turkish industrial exports with the exception of certain products explicitly referred to (certain petroleum products, certain special textile products for which the French customs procedure has been limited by tariff quotas).

The Commission fully realizes the need to ensure that foreign trade complies with normal competition conditions. The 1973 Additional Protocol also lays down a certain number of provisions regarding competition and tax rules similar to those set at in the Treaty of Rome on whose respect the Commission is insisting within the context of EEC-Turkey relations.

The recent decisions of the EEC-Turkey Association Council of 30 June 1980 have not changed the arrangement applicable to export of Turkish industrial products to the Community.

Realizing the difficulties being experienced by the European textile industry, the Commission is continuing to try and find an arrangement with Turkey within the framework of the Association Council.

*Question No 38, by Mr Donnez (H-286/80): held over**Question No 39 by Mr Bettiza (H-286/80)*

Subject: Community contribution to measures to control erosion in Ravenna

Is the Commission aware of the appeal issued by the city of Ravenna to the European Parliament and to national authorities for the Community to help solve the problem of subsidence and coastal erosion in the Ravenna area, where the land has sunk more than a metre in the last few years; and in view of this region's inestimable cultural, historical and artistic value in European terms, could it indicate what practical scope exists for aid under the EEC's 1981 budget to supplement the damming, excavating and aqueduct work and to deal with the ebb-water?

*Answer*

The Commission is aware of the erosion threatening the city of Ravenna and of the possible consequences for the cultural and artistic heritage of the city.

However, as it now stands, the Community budget does not allow the provision of sums of money from existing Community Funds as the city of Ravenna is not located in a region covered by the Regional Fund, and the other Funds are not designed to provide aid of this kind.

Nonetheless, the Commission believes that there is reason to hope that a token entry of 100 000 units of account will be entered in the draft budget for the creation of an Environment Fund to provide Community financial aid for the preservation of architectural heritage as well as the amount entered in the 1980 budget thanks to the good sense and action of the European Parliament. The case of Ravenna could be considered under this heading provided national or regional measures are adopted.

At the same time the Commission feels that, since the causes and appropriate solutions to the problem in question have not been adequately studied, the Commission could consider the possibility of having a technical study of the question carried out.

*Question No 40, by Mr Curry (H-288/80)*

Subject: Beef taken into intervention

In the light of the quantities of beef recently going into intervention, does the Commission believe that it will be necessary to revise its estimates of the cost of the beef regime in 1980 and does it intend to renew its proposals to suspend intervention for beef during the summer months?

*Answer*

1. In the light of the quantities of beef which may be bought-in by the intervention agencies in 1980, the Commission in its correcting letter of 6 June to the draft budget for 1980, increased by 105 m EUA the estimate for public intervention. The Council took up this increase and, during its 26/27 June part-session Parliament took a position on the draft Council Budget thus increased.
2. The Council, meeting on 28, 29, and 30 May 1980 extended the measures already in application as regards the optional suspension of intervention as well as the derogation for Ireland.

The Commission will make a report on the application of these measures before 1 December 1980. The Commission at this point does not wish to prejudice any conclusions which such a report might lead to.

*Question No 42, by Mr Lalor (H-291/80)*

Subject: Deferment of payment of excise duty

Will the Commission indicate, in the case of the Member States other than Ireland, any instances where deferment of payment of excise duty on beer or spirits is permitted on a more favourable basis to domestic production than to imports; and in respect of any such instances, what course of action does the Commission envisage taking?

*Answer*

The decision by which the Court of Justice established that Ireland's provisions on deferment of duty discriminated against imported alcoholic beverage, and therefore contravened the terms of Article 95 of the Treaty, resolved a problem of principle to which the Commission attaches great importance. Its consequences are not limited to the field of taxes on alcoholic drinks, but cover all goods.

These consequences have been drawn to the attention of the Member States, who must be expected to review their legislation in the light of the Court's decision.

The Commission is nevertheless in course of compiling an inventory of all Member States provisions on deferment of duty. When that inventory is completed, the Commission will be in a position to take action against any Member State which has not brought its legislation into line with the Court's decision.

## SITTING OF TUESDAY, 8 JULY 1980

Points of order: Mr Pannella; Mrs Scrivener

1. Approval of the minutes . . . . .	40	Question No 43 by Mr Adam: New Community energy initiative:	
2. Membership of committees . . . . .	40	Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council; Mr Adam; Mr Thorn; Mr Griffiths; Mr Thorn; Mrs Ewing; Mr Thorn; Mr Moreland; Mr Thorn . . . . .	93
3. Statement by the President . . . . .	40	Question No 44 by Sir John Stewart-Clark: Protection of animals during international transport:	
4. Decision on urgency:		Mr Thorn; Sir John Stewart-Clark; Mr Thorn; Mr Howell; Mr Thorn . . . . .	94
Mr Lange, chairman of the Committee on Budgets; Mr Adam; Mr Schieler; Mrs Agnelli; Mrs Macciocchi (TC) . . . . .	40	Question No 45 by Mr Seal: Treaty of Rome and application of Community legislation in Member States:	
5. First anniversary of the election of Parliament by direct universal suffrage . . . . .	41	Mr Thorn; Mr Seal; Mr Thorn; Mr Welsh; Mr Thorn; Mr Megaly, Mr Thorn; Mr van Aerssen; Mr Thorn . . . . .	95
6. Tabling of proposals for the total rejection of the new draft general budget for 1980 . . . . .	43	Question No 46 by Mrs Ewing: European Institute for Economic and Social Policy Research:	
7. Council statement on the Luxembourg Presidency:		Mr Thorn; Mrs Ewing; Mr Thorn; Miss Quin; Mr Thorn . . . . .	97
Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council; Mr Glinne (S); Mr Scott-Hopkins (ED); Mr Berlinguer (COM); Mr Lecanuet (EPP); Mr Rey (L); Mrs Ewing (EPD); Mr Pannella; Mr De Goede; Mr Kirk; Mr Piquet; Mrs Dienesch; Mr Ryan; Mr Curry; Mr Almirante; Mr Narducci; Lord O'Hagan; Mr Romualdi; Mr Alber; Mr Pannella . . . . .	43	Question No 47 by Mr Remilly: Indexation of oil prices:	
Point of order: Mr Pannella . . . . .	72	Mr Thorn . . . . .	98
8. Urgent procedure . . . . .	73	Question No 48 by Mr Kavanagh: Meeting of Education Ministers:	
9. Agenda . . . . .	73	Mr Thorn; Mr Kavanagh; Mr Thorn; Mr Key; Mr Thorn; Mr Schwencke; Mr Thorn; Mr Price; Mr Thorn; Mr Möller; Mr Thorn; Mrs Dienesch; Mr Thorn . . . . .	98
10. Council statement on the Luxembourg Presidency (continuation):		Question No 49 by Mr Seligman: International harmonization of energy prices and taxes:	
Lord Harmar-Nicholls; Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council . . . . .	73	Mr Thorn; Mr Seligman; Mr Thorn; Mr Galland; Mr Thorn . . . . .	100
11. Amendment of Parliament's Rules of Procedure — Report by Mr Luster on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions (Doc. 1-148/80/corr.):		Questions to the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation: . . . . .	101
Mrs Vayssade (S); Mr Adonnino (EPP); Mr Patterson (ED) . . . . .	78	Question No 62 by Mr van Miert: Consultation with the United States:	
Points of order: Mr Pannella; Lord Harmar-Nicholls . . . . .	84	Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers . . . . .	101
Mr Chambeiron (COM); Mr Nord (L); Mrs Dekker; Mr Pannella; Mr D'Angelosante; Mr Galland; Mr Coppieters; Mr Tyrrell; Mrs Hammerich; Mr Capanna; Mr Spicer; Mr Luster . . . . .	84	Questions No 64 by Mr Fergusson: Danger of chemical warfare to civilian population, and No 65 by Mr Hutton: Prevention of chemical warfare:	
12. Urgent procedure . . . . .	92	Mr Thorn; Mr Fergusson; Mr Thorn; Mr Hutton; Mr Thorn . . . . .	101
13. Question Time (Doc. 1-287/80);		Question No 66 by Mr Penders: CSCE (Madrid follow-up conference):	
Question to the Council of the European Communities: . . . . .	93		

Mr Thorn; Mr Penders; Mr Thorn; Mrs Maij-Weggen; Mr Thorn . . . . .	103
Question No 67 by Mr Lalor: Solutions to the Afghanistan crisis:	
Mr Thorn; Mr Lalor; Mr Thorn; Mr Spicer; Mr Thorn; Lord Harmar-Nicholls; Mr Thorn . . . . .	104

Question No 68 by Mr Israël: Conference in Madrid:	
Mr Thorn; Mr Israël; Mr Thorn . . . . .	105
14. Agenda for next sitting . . . . .	106
Annex . . . . .	107

## IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

*President*

*(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is open.

I call Mr Pannella to speak on a point of order.

*(Laughter and applause)*

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* This is an interesting development — the applause is now for the left!

Madam President, I want simply to point out that, if my information is correct, we are being invited to an increasing number of committee and working party meetings, especially today. I am quite sure that this is not due to a lack of respect for the President of the Council who is coming to make a statement to us today. But it is certainly a lack of respect for the rights and duties of Members of Parliament. We cannot be continually required, to an ever-increasing extent, to choose between our institutional obligations to the Assembly and our work in committee. I know very well that the Bureau, or the enlarged Bureau, has decided this, Madam President, but once again we greatly regret the fact that decisions are being taken which do not seem to accord with the spirit, and often with the letter, of our Rules.

**President.** — I call Mrs Scrivener.

**Mrs Scrivener.** — *(F)* Madam President, I endorse what Mr Pannella has said and suggest that committees should only meet during the part-session when there is an imperative need for them to do so. The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection is to meet today. I do not believe that its meeting is imperative and I wanted to draw your attention to this, Madam President, because I do not think it right for Members to be absent during debates in the Chamber.

**President.** — Because of the extraordinary part-session in Luxembourg some of Parliament's committees were unable to hold their usual meetings, and for this reason the Bureau decided to authorize these committees and delegations, by way of exception, to hold their meetings today. It was essential that the meetings take place, as these committees had some urgent reports to dispose of before the Summer recess. I might mention, by way of example, the report on world hunger — a short meeting had to be held to deal with this. The Bureau authorized certain committees to meet on the strict understanding that these badly-needed meetings would be kept very short.

In general, however, the Bureau is extremely strict in the matter of granting authorizations to committees to meet during the part-sessions. We have even been accused of being short-sighted bureaucrats for refusing to allow committees to meet during part-sessions, even when they badly needed to do so, and several committee chairmen have rapped us over the knuckles for being too severe in this regard.

In principle the Bureau does not permit meetings between delegations of Members of Parliament and various associations. Meetings of this kind are often held without prior notification, but we try to limit them.

I would remind all Members of this Parliament that if the Chamber is often almost empty, it is because of these meetings held without prior authorization, which divert the Members into various extraneous activities and frequently take up the time of the interpreters and other officials.

To return, however, to the question of official authorizations, compelling reasons must be advanced every time such authorization is requested, and the Bureau tries not to grant authorization unless it is absolutely necessary for an opinion to be delivered or some urgent piece of work to be completed. As far as inter-parliamentary delegations are concerned, we may sometimes feel inclined to allow them to meet, for the sole reason that since the members belong to different committees, they will never be together in Brussels. Often the only time they come together is during part-sessions. This is why we sometimes authorize very brief meetings to enable an interparliamentary delega-

**President**

tion to make preparations for a forthcoming meeting with a delegation from some foreign Parliament.

1. *Approval of the minutes*

**President.** — The minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting have been distributed.

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

2. *Membership of committees*

**President.** — I have received a request from the Group of European Progressive Democrats for the appointment of Mr Christian de la Malène as a member of the European Parliament delegation to the Joint Parliamentary Committee of the EEC-Greece Association.

Are there any objections?

This appointment is ratified.

3. *Statement by the President*

**President.** — In accordance with the wish expressed by Parliament during yesterday's sitting I have sent the following telegram to the President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities:

During its sitting today the European Parliament was unable to consider the motion for a resolution contained in the report by Mr Janssen van Raay, on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the development of a coordinated European air traffic control system (Doc. 1-274/80).

In accordance with the wishes expressed by Parliament I should be very grateful if you would draw the attention of the Ministers currently meeting to discuss Eurocontrol to the contents of this document and point out that the European Parliament has decided to take up a position on the motion for a resolution at its sitting of Thursday, 10 July 1980 and expects the Ministers to take account of its deliberations before taking any final decisions, particularly as regards the future of Eurocontrol.

With many thanks and sincere good wishes.

(Applause)

4. *Decision on urgency*

**President.** — The next item is a decision on two requests for urgent procedure.

We shall begin with the *request from the Council (Doc. 1-273/80): Proposals for regulations concerning the*

*United Kingdom's contribution to the general budget of the Communities and a financial mechanism.*

I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange, chairman of the Committee on Budgets.**

— (D) Madam President, to allow a thorough examination to be made of the proposals submitted by the Commission, I ask the House not to agree to this request for urgency. Furthermore, the 1980 budget does not include a single unit of account for the refund to the United Kingdom. The intention is to have this proposal ready for a decision to be taken by September. In the meantime, the rapporteur will have an opportunity to discuss quite a number of outstanding questions with the Commission, so that in September the committees involved and the House can then take a decision objectively in full knowledge of the facts. Once again, I would ask the House to reject this request from the Council and Commission for urgency.

**President.** — I call Mr Adam.

**Mr Adam.** — Madam President, I do not know how other Members are placed, but the particular document that you refer to has certainly not reached me and I wonder why it is in order to take this point on the agenda this morning.

**President.** — Right now, Mr Adam, we are not discussing the contents of the document, but only the request for urgent procedure. This document was, in fact, distributed on 25 June last.

I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote.

The request is rejected.

**President.** — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution by Mr Schieler and others, on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Wawrzik and others, on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party, and Mrs Agnelli and others, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group (Doc. 1-284/80): Aid to refugees in the South China Sea.*

I call Mr Schieler.

**Mr Schieler.** — (D) Madam President, this motion, which has been tabled on behalf of three groups, concerns aid to refugees in the South China Sea. We have received news of a dramatic increase in the number of refugees in the South China Sea — 10 000 people a month and still rising. We know that many of these refugees drown or are in danger of drowning. We know that at present only one European ship is



**Schieler**

operating in the South China Sea that can bring help to these people. Without financial help and without the solidarity of the European Community, there is a danger that this last ship operating in these waters will also have to withdraw. I therefore ask the House to approve this request for urgency.

**President.** — I call Mrs Agnelli.

**Mrs Agnelli.** — (*I*) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, in supporting the urgency of this motion for a resolution, I wish to comment briefly on the remarks made by Mrs De March. She expressed her regret that the authors of the present motion did not concern themselves in the same way some time ago with the American invasion of Vietnam. In fact we expressed an identical concern at the time and did so clearly both verbally and in writing. It is curious that when we said that there could be no possible justification for dropping napalm bombs on children we were accused of holding left-wing views, whereas now we are criticized as supporters of the right when we seek to save the lives of Cambodian children.

When human lives are at stake, there is no left or right. I see no difference between injustice in Chile and injustice in Vietnam; the victims suffer the same fate. In the present instance, it is an act of pure humanity to ask for financial support for the only remaining vessel operating in this area which will be obliged to suspend its activities unless funds are forthcoming. Hundreds of persons are still facing a terrible death in their desperate attempt to find refuge at sea. I should hope that even Mrs De March, in common with our other colleagues, will be able to support this request which is not political; it is not a motion of the right or left but simply a matter of human solidarity.

(*Applause*)

**President.** — I call Mrs Macciocchi to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

**Mrs Macciocchi.** — (*I*) Madam President, on behalf of my Group I wish to support the urgency of this motion for a resolution which, even before it was drafted and tabled, enjoyed the strong support of the individual members of our group. The Presidency will recall our commitment for Parliament to support our proposal to send a delegation to Cambodia, even if that request has been postponed for a long time. We would hope that the Presidency will be able, on the occasion of this motion for a resolution, to say what has happened about that delegation which has an immediate bearing on the matter now under discussion.

We have thus already broached the topic of children in this part of the world and, at the invitation of the Presidency, we were able to arrange discussions with the UN High Commissioner for Refugees. A great deal of study, thought and work has already been put in on this matter, making it essential for us now to consider — despite the objections voiced in some quarters — all the implications of this great tragedy which, as we recently saw from a documentary film broadcast by a French television channel, can only be compared to the extermination of the Jews in Auschwitz.

**President.** — I think that the Bureau's decision on this delegation will be known on Friday.

I put the request for urgent procedure to the vote.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

This item will be entered on the agenda for the sitting of Friday, 11 July.

#### 5. *First anniversary of the election of Parliament by direct universal suffrage*

**President.** — Today I should like to give you a brief review of the activities of the directly elected European Parliament in the first year of its existence.

The task facing our Parliament is enormous, but already much has been achieved.

Firstly, there is the exercise of our consultative function. From 17 July 1979 to 27 June 1980 the European Parliament was consulted on 161 occasions, to which must be added almost 40 reports held over from the previous Parliament. During this time our Assembly sat on 59 days divided over 14 part-sessions and delivered 143 opinions, including matters dealt with by the procedure without report, to which must be added 44 own-initiative reports. That so many opinions could be delivered is due to the hard work of the committees in drawing up their reports so promptly. Up to 30 June 1980 there were only 41 requests for consultation before the committees. However, the committees had had 380 requests for reports, but 90 % of these were the result of motions for resolutions tabled by individual Members of Parliament pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, own-initiative reports and petitions, the rest being requests from the Council for opinions. Thus, contrary to any fears that may have been expressed, it is clear that the new Parliament has carried out its task without in any way putting a brake on the Community's legislative work. This is all the more remarkable by reason of the fact that the number of requests from the Council for consultation was exceptionally high at the end of last summer, because

### President

many of these consultations had been left in abeyance in anticipation of the election of the new Parliament.

I should like to pay special tribute to the work of the committees which have held 264 meetings, half as many again as during previous years. To this must be added the meetings of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Women's Rights, which meant an extra work-load for its members in addition to their work as members of other committees.

The regular and conscientious attendance of members at committee meetings, thus enabling the latter to do valuable work, is proof of the awareness of each and every member of his or her responsibility to the citizens who elected us.

In this connection I feel that, as certain colleagues stressed once again yesterday, it is important that our committees should keep themselves particularly well-informed on the action taken by the Commission and the Council in response to our opinions, so that the Parliament as a whole can closely monitor the impact of the opinions we deliver.

To a far greater extent than has been the case in the past the committees have been making use of the public hearing. These hearings have proved that when they are well organized and prepared they can enable Parliament to have a remarkable influence on public opinion.

Furthermore, the European Parliament has clearly demonstrated that, sustained by the legitimacy conferred on it by its election by direct universal suffrage, it is determined to ask the political questions that are vital to the future of the Community. It did so in particular during the consideration of the 1980 draft budget, when it availed itself for the first time of its right to reject the budget.

In addition to the control exercised by means of their budgetary powers, the Members of Parliament made extensive use of the opportunities afforded them by their right to ask questions. It must be admitted that we have had to put a stricter limit on the number of oral questions with debate that could be put on the agenda, and this has led us to try to convert them into questions for Question Time or written questions. So many questions have been put down that it was not always possible to deal with them in Question Time and that they got written replies from the Council and the Commission only after some delay. However, we must do our utmost to preserve the smooth and effective operation of these procedures, which constitute for all Members of this Parliament a very effective means of carrying out their unremitting task of exercising democratic control.

The European Parliament has attached ever greater importance to the problem of political cooperation

and to discussing the major international issues with the Council. In addition, it has devoted a number of its urgent debates to violations of human rights.

In its anxiety to strengthen relations between the Community and the rest of the world, Parliament has set up delegations to third countries, which have enabled us to improve our contacts with some of our major partners, particularly the United States, Canada and China. At the same time it has forged stronger links with the parliamentary institutions of the countries at present negotiating their accession to the Community, whose representatives will be sitting amongst us before very long.

Our Parliament has thus helped to foster a clearer understanding of the role that a united, independent and democratic Europe is determined to play on the world stage.

Within the institutions established by the Convention of Lomé the European Parliament has strengthened the very close relations it had forged with the representatives of the ACP States in the Consultative Assembly. The success of this assembly is due in large measure to the work of the Joint Committee which, both in its Luxembourg and Arusha meetings, distinguished itself by its energy and its remarkable spirit of cooperation.

From the very outset the new directly elected Parliament has been concerned to work hand in hand with the other institutions for the advancement of the Community. We are very gratified by the help the Commission has given us in our work, both by attending our plenary sittings and by taking part in the work of our committees and delegations. We hope that in future this dialogue will become ever more vibrant, meeting the concerns expressed by Parliament and furthering the progress of our Community.

We have been gratified and impressed by the fact that the President-in-Office of the Council not only attends our part-sessions but also has taken part on a number of occasions in our committee meetings. Parliament regrets, however, that the Council has not always given it the attention warranted by the importance of the subjects under discussion and has not entered into more open and wholehearted cooperation with it.

The progress of the European Community demands, particularly in these trying times, that its institutions should work hand in hand, each one respecting the function and tasks of the others. In this connection we hope that the Council will be made more fully aware of the new dimension given to the Community by the election of its Parliament by direct universal suffrage. This is the wish I should like to express as we embark on this second year of our existence.

6. *Tabling of proposals for the total rejection of the new draft general budget for 1980*

**President.** — The deadline for tabling proposals for the total rejection of the 1980 budget has now expired.

I have received two proposals for total rejection:

- From Mr Balfe and others (Doc. 1-294/80),
- from Mr Pannella and others (Doc. 1-300/80).

I would remind the House that, in accordance with the decisions taken yesterday by Parliament, statements on these proposals will be made tomorrow morning at the beginning of the sitting and that the vote will be held tomorrow afternoon.

7. *Council statement on the Luxembourg Presidency*

**President.** — The next item is the statement by the President-in-Office of the Council on the programme of the Luxembourg Presidency, which will be followed by a debate.

I call Mr Thorn.

**Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (F) Madam President, ladies and gentleman, as you have just pointed out, it is one year since Europe of the voters was born. Almost a year ago to the day, the directly-elected European Parliament held its first sitting in this very chamber. Having had the privilege of taking part as an elected Member, I feel entitled therefore to share with you the pride of this anniversary.

I feel that when all the rhetoric and polemics have been set aside, it must be acknowledged that the Parliament has adequately shown in these first 12 months that it is a vital and effective institution. After an initial period, during which it had to elaborate its instruments and working methods, it is now in a position to meet with ever increasing effectiveness the large number of consultations asked of it by the Council. I am particularly grateful for this, for I am convinced that it is above all in the development of this collaboration in the legislative field that we must seek the best path forward towards an increased and genuine participation of your Assembly in the life of this Community. Furthermore, Parliament has shown its extreme sensitivity to the political problems facing the Community and its determination to play to the full its part as the driving force, the controlling institution and the conscience of Europe, both with regard to the Community's internal development and to the fulfilment of its responsibilities to the world outside, each one being unthinkable without the other.

Madam President, ladies and gentleman, in accordance with the rotation system practised in the institution I represent here, it falls to me to succeed to a particularly valuable Presidency to which I must pay generous tribute.

It is scarcely three months since there were serious doubts as to whether the Community could survive in its previous form and spirit. I feel that it was an exceptional stroke of good fortune that at that moment the Presidency was held by a Member State which, even though it was experiencing within its own boundaries the effects of the imbalances in Community policies repeatedly condemned by your Assembly, nevertheless gave proof of a remarkable Community consciousness.

It was undoubtedly this commitment to the Community which inspired its actions, as it also inspired the unshakeable determination of the Prime Minister of Italy and the political commitment of our joint friend and your former President, Mr Emilio Colombo.

Our Community has just emerged from a crisis which for several months slowed down and almost blocked entirely the activity of the institutions. After long negotiations, the Council has succeeded in taking the essential political decisions which has enabled it to arrive at the agreement of 30 May last. We must not, however, conceal from ourselves the fact that even though this agreement has set the machine in motion again, all the problems have not been solved. We must now bend all our efforts to implement in practice the decisions taken, in order to carry out the structural changes which will be needed to improve the essential mechanisms of our Community which are greatly in need of revision for the purpose of increasing the Community's cohesion and solidarity. It is a long-term task, as we all know, but the first steps must be taken straight away, and there can be no doubt that your Parliament will be able to contribute very valuable ideas and suggestions.

In any case we have resumed our forward march, and we have decided with Parliament's support to tackle resolutely the major problems posed for us today by European history.

It would be inconceivable that in the face of the present threats to world peace and the major economic and social challenges that weigh so heavily on the welfare, development and stability of our countries and of the entire world, the Community should fail to play its part, to put forward adequate solutions and to play the rôle called for by its potential and its ideals, and called for not as a right alone but also as a definite duty.

Amongst all these challenges, there are two that seem to me to take pride of place, not only because they come first in time, but also because they have such a vital bearing on economic growth and political stabil-

**Thorn**

ity. I refer here to the energy crisis and to relations between the industrialized and the developing countries.

As you know, the energy crisis loomed large in recent international conferences, along with the difficulties it brings in its train and the means that must be used to tackle this situation.

In this connection, particular stress was laid on the extremely serious consequences, particularly for the economies of the industrialized countries, but also for those of the developing countries that are not producers of energy, of the recent oil price rises decided upon by OPEC, rises which are very difficult to justify in the light of market realities.

Recognizing, however, that it has less and less influence over the price policies of the oil-producing countries, the Western world is bending its efforts to working out ways and means of decreasing, as far as possible, its dependence on oil.

The efforts the Community will have to make in the coming years to achieve this objective relate first of all to increasing energy savings, and secondly to replacing oil by other sources of energy, such as coal and — we must emphasize this — nuclear energy. We shall also have to make every effort to increase European energy production.

On of the practical measures that can be taken in this context will be to convert electric power stations at present being fuelled by oil into coal-fired stations, as well as putting a halt to the construction of all new power stations of the former kind. The new electricity generating stations to be built in the decade now commencing will have to use mainly nuclear energy or coal.

This departure from the use of oil in the production of electricity will have to be accompanied by the replacement of oil in heavy industry and domestic use in order to make more of it available for the transport sector where, for the present at any rate, it would be very difficult to replace.

Furthermore, we will also have to encourage investment for research into and development of new alternative sources of energy, particularly synthetic oil and gas derived from coal.

Finally, every possible effort will have to be pursued, and pursued vigorously, to enter into a constructive dialogue with the oil-producing countries in order to restore order to the energy sector, which is so vital for the world's economy and in particular, as I have already said, for those countries which are struggling to gain an economic foothold, but which do not produce energy and are in danger of seeing all their hopes for progress and development being dashed.

It is in this spirit, Madam President, and in the pursuit of these objectives, that our Presidency will spare no effort to adopt, on the basis of the Commission's proposals, the measures needed at Community level.

The other major problem on the world scale, but imposing a particular responsibility on the Community, is that of development, and indeed it is closely linked with the previous problem. We can no longer simply continue to live in a world where the gulf between rich and poor countries widens every year. Some say it is immoral, others say it is unjust, but I would simply add that it is a extremely dangerous policy for all of us.

*(Applause)*

I intend to attach primary importance to our relations with the developing world at the twofold level of the contractual relations between our Community and the developing countries throughout the world and of the North-South Dialogue in general. These are only two complementary facets of one and the same operation which is related to an overall vision of the new kinds of relations we must establish with these countries.

As you all know, our Community is linked to the developing countries by a network of contractual agreements which, for both number and quality, are unparalleled in the entire world. These contractual relations are one of the essential elements of Community policy with regard to North-South relations. This policy provides a framework for permanent dialogue and practical and realistic cooperation with individual States and regional groupings. I can promise you that the Luxembourg Presidency will do its utmost to strengthen and develop these relations.

Our first concern will be to see Lomé II come into force as soon as possible. It will soon be one year since this Convention was signed. I should like to urge all those Members of this House, who are in a position to do so, to speed up the parliamentary procedures still being carried out in six of our Member States, so that they can be speedily completed and so that the Convention can enter into force during this last quarter of the year, and by 1 January next at the latest.

We also pay very particular attention to the development and strengthening of our cooperation with the Mediterranean and Middle Eastern countries. Following the recent meetings of the Cooperation Council with Egypt and the Lebanon, ministerial meetings with Israel and Algeria are planned for October next.

We are also going to work for the reactivation of the Euro-Arab dialogue in accordance with the conclusions of the European Council in Venice, of which you all have been informed. Finally, still in pursuit of the policy of balanced and open-minded relations, we hope that we can soon complete negotiations now

## Thorn

being pursued with India and the Andean Pact countries.

From a multilateral point of view, the extraordinary General Assembly of the United Nations which meets in August seems to me to be of crucial importance.

It is taking place in a very difficult context, the main feature of which is the persistent recession aggravated by recent oil price increases, of which the principal victims are, as I have said, the weakest members of the international community. It is, however, precisely this difficult situation which should impel us not to overlook the importance of this meeting. The Luxembourg Presidency will assume its full responsibilities arising out of that political commitment entered into by the Heads of State or Government in Venice in relation to the revitalization of the North-South Dialogue and the Third Development Strategy.

In New York it will be important to draw up an agenda and devise procedural solutions enabling us to lay the foundations for negotiations which will restore confidence and security to international economic relations. In the general interest it must be our aim to avert a generalized recession and to solve the more urgent problems impeding the development of the Third World.

I do not want to anticipate at this point the Council's discussion of 22 July of these problems, in the light of the results of the preparatory work that has just been concluded in New York. But I must express here my conviction that it must be possible to work out a common platform for realistic and practical negotiations, avoiding the pitfalls of, on the one hand, negotiations that would founder through trying to cover every possible subject and, on the other, a negotiation that would end up as a mere trading of formal concessions. All the parties concerned, particularly the underprivileged countries, must find reflected in this platform perhaps not all their concerns, but at least their major concerns. The ideals of mutual advantage, common interest and shared responsibility, which are the basis of all international relations, are the only premises on which to build the success of the North-South dialogue.

The other major task that awaits us in the field of foreign relations is the active pursuit of the objectives relating to the second enlargement of the Community. Now that Greece's entry on 1 January next is a certainty, with the recent deposit of the last of the instruments of ratification, our activities in the field of enlargement will concentrate on the negotiations with Spain and Portugal.

We intend to respect the jointly agreed timetable for the work relating to the accession of these two countries.

Parliament will, I am sure, want to know what the Luxembourg Presidency intends to do in the matter of pursuing the accession negotiations with Spain and Portugal. My first concern is to put you on your guard against any mischievous dramatization of the difficulties that will inevitably arise in a process upon which the Community as a whole and the two applicant countries have embarked with full awareness of its historic importance, but also of the problems which it poses for all sides.

The negotiations being carried out at various levels enable us to claim already a number of positive results, which, of course, have to be confirmed in the context of overall results, as is customary in such negotiations. In certain crucial areas, however, the real negotiations have yet to be embarked upon. It was recognized in advance that in the agriculture and fishery sectors the problems posed by accession would be added to by those arising from the adaptation of the '*acquis communautaire*'. That is nothing new. The combination of these two aspects will constitute not only one of the most difficult items in the entire negotiations but will also be one of the vital questions within the perspective of establishing a better balance between Community policies.

It is clear that there will have to be serious thought and valiant efforts at adaptation within our Community, and the effect of this on the enlargement negotiations, and *vice versa*, cannot be overlooked.

The timetables jointly agreed at the beginning of these negotiations have been respected on the whole up to now. In the coming months it will be the concern of our presidency to see the tempo of these negotiations is not slowed down, even if it seems over-ambitious to want to fix a precise date for their conclusion before the really serious debate has been entered upon.

Finally, I am happy to say that last week we were able to take decisions enabling us to reactivate and develop our association with Turkey.

The decisions taken concern the various facets of the agreement, i.e. agriculture, social provisions, economic and technical cooperation and the Financial Protocol, and also take account of the special economic difficulties of our partner State.

On the internal front, one of the major issues that will confront the Luxembourg Presidency, as you can well imagine, is the initiation of the procedure that will lead to the adoption of the 1981 budget.

First of all, I should like to express my warm congratulations on the conclusion of the budgetary procedure for the present year. Despite the genuine difficulties encountered on both sides, we were finally able to reach agreement, thanks — and I would stress this — to the valiant efforts and the political sensitivity shown, on the one hand, by your Parliament and, on

### Thorn

the other, by the Council, which was vigorously and unrelentingly urged onwards by the Italian Presidency.

The budget for the coming year will undoubtedly be influenced by the major issues that are still under discussion: the structural modifications on which, as I have already said, we must get down to work straight away, the quest for improved convergence between the economies of the Member States, the restoration of a better balance in Community action and financial affairs, and finally, the situation in which we shall find ourselves when we reach the present ceiling of own resources. This is something that is giving us all food for thought at the present time.

I have to say quite frankly that it would not be very realistic to hope to solve all the problems relating to the budgetary procedure, or to think that one was capable of solving them. However, it is clear that we shall both have to keep them firmly in mind if we wish to endow the Community with adequate ways and means of pursuing and developing its activity and to effect the strengthening of the Community which was already being mooted over 10 years ago.

Still on the internal front, we shall have to tackle the challenges posed by the economic and social situation. The pressures of inflation still constitute the most serious threat to the development of our economies and compel us to regard the fight against inflation as our first objective. We shall try, by maintaining monetary stability and pursuing sound monetary and fiscal policies, to encourage investment and promote growth.

From this point of view, the European Monetary System, which has worked well up to now, continues to be, as far as I am concerned, a vital element in maintaining monetary stability, both at Community and world level. In this connection, the Community must continue to facilitate the process of recycling petro-dollars, which are so much in the news, and to do this within the framework of international and world financial institutions. In the meantime, we shall in the coming months push forward the technical efforts relating to the transition at the appropriate time to the second stage of our monetary system.

These coordinated policies must, however, slot in to an overall strategy worked out at Community level, and in conformity with all other aspects of this policy, namely, the establishment of greater economic stability, a sterner fight against inflation, the promotion of investment and more sustained action in favour of the social classes, sectors and regions most affected by the crisis. In this connection the activities of the Social and Regional Funds must be better coordinated, and this is essentially the responsibility of the Commission.

It will be important to work out a more coordinated approach to employment problems with a view to

framing an employment policy that can step up the struggle against unemployment. We shall do our utmost to see that the various decisions the Community will be called upon to make in the social sector in the second half of the year are really aimed at achieving these objectives and do not simply break down into a number of excessively fragmented activities, however valuable in itself each of these activities might be.

The Luxembourg Presidency intends to work along these lines; it will do its utmost to pursue and develop dialogue with the social partners at Community level, particularly within the Standing Committee on Employment, as it is deeply aware of the important contribution our social partners can make to solving the present problems.

In the area of industrial policy and the internal market, there are three main strands that must continue to inspire our actions.

Our first essential task will be to maintain the cohesion of the Community market and to strengthen it even further. Every one of you realizes that this will not be easy in the present economic situation, but you must agree that the fundamental Community stance, which is the free movement of goods in free competition, remains a trump card and a feature of the utmost value. I would say that it is the vital element in the health and competitiveness of our economy. The activities carried out here under various aspects, technical, legal, fiscal and so on, in order to ensure the existence and cohesion of this single market, must be pursued with the utmost determination.

However, we must not — and this will be our second concern — relax the attention we are paying to the development of those sectors which have launched an all-out effort to adapt to new economic conditions. I refer in particular to sectors, particularly steel and textiles, where action has been taken and is being developed at Community level. At this level, careful reflection in the light of overall prospects could enable us to envisage the manner in which these industrial sectors can respond in a dynamic fashion to the new conditions on the international market.

Finally, it only remains for me to try to define more clearly the rôle that our Community can play in supporting the development of new and sophisticated technologies that can generate employment, and I am thinking here in particular of the telematics sector of which we have already had occasion to speak. We must strive after a Community approach to the social and industrial aspects of these technologies and closer coordination of the activities being carried out at national level. The Council looks forward to having new Commission proposals in this sector submitted to it.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, having highlighted the major questions facing our Community in

## Thorn

these difficult times, questions arising from the EEC Treaties, I should now devote some attention to the other facet of Community activity, by which I mean political cooperation.

Most of the tasks that will have to be shouldered by the Presidency in this area will be related to or dictated by the timetable of international conferences.

It is by now a well-established tradition that the Nine carefully coordinate the positions they intend to take up at the United Nations General Assembly. Happily, the Nine are coming to be regarded more and more as a unit, which greatly increases their ability to influence events. It is all the more important that discordant notes should not be heard too often within this unit. I promise you, in any case, that this Presidency will do its utmost to see that the Community acts and is seen to act as a Community.

I myself will have an opportunity to take part in the general debate of the Assembly in New York, and I can assure you that I intend to devote a large section of my speech to outlining the common positions of the Member States of the European Community.

Another important meeting which will require much preparation and coordination is the meeting in Madrid within the framework of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The Member States of the European Community, which have always played a very active part, as you will remember, in previous phases of the CSCE, have been engaged for the last three long months in preparing at expert level for the Madrid meeting. It will be very important for us to see to it that the implementation of all sections of the Final Act of Helsinki, without any exception, is subjected to careful and critical examination. This is where we can make new progress in the area of human rights, free movement of persons and information, economic cooperation and disarmament.

One question which you are asking in this context, and rightly so, is whether the events of Afghanistan will not have some effect on the Madrid meeting. The political leaders of the Member States of the European Community have discussed on several occasions the situation brought about by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. On the most recent occasion, at the European Council in Venice, the Heads of State or Government noted with deep anxiety the stepping up of the military operations being carried out by Soviet troops in Afghanistan, which threaten to compromise irrevocably the climate of international relations. Some solution must be found to bring about the withdrawal of these troops and enable the Afghan people to exercise freely their right to determine their own destiny.

A partial withdrawal of the Soviet troops such as was recently announced, if it should be confirmed on the spot, would probably be a step in the right direction.

Nevertheless, and I wish to emphasize this here, only a total withdrawal will restore the only situation that can conform to international law and morality.

*(Applause)*

This situation throws a long shadow over the Madrid meeting inasmuch as it raises grave doubts as to the Soviet idea of détente, because détente is at once the basis and the objective of the entire CSCE process. Nevertheless, the Community Member States feel that the dialogue must be maintained and that the Madrid meeting is one of the important contacts which must not be broken off. The task of the Nine, and consequently that of the Presidency, will naturally be more difficult than it would have seemed before December 1979.

Iran, unfortunately, threatens to remain a subject of concern for the Nine. The hostages detained in flagrant violation of international law have not yet been released, and this has led the Community to impose sanctions on Iran. The Nine hope that this unfortunate situation will soon be resolved, and we are prepared, as we have been over all these long months, to make our contribution. Only when the hostages have been freed can the positive aspects of the Islamic revolution in Iran be properly assessed and the traditional ties between Iran and Europe restored.

The Presidency, and your humble servant personally, will have to devote special attention to the situation in the Middle East. As you know, the European Council in Venice discussed this problem at great length and devoted an important statement to it.

In line with positions previously taken, the Heads of State or Government declared that the time had arrived to promote the recognition and implementation of two principles universally acknowledged by the international community, namely, the right of all the States in that area, including Israel, to existence and security, and in addition, justice for all these peoples, which implies recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. They pointed out — and you will understand that this refers particularly to the State of Israel — that all countries in that area have the right to live in peace behind certain, acknowledged and guaranteed frontiers.

They also stated that the Palestinian people, who have an awareness of their existence as a people and not merely as refugees, should be enabled to exercise fully their right to self-determination by means of an appropriate procedure to be laid down within the framework of overall measures for peace. The Nine feel that the principles thus set out must be obeyed both by Israelis and Arabs, as well as by the Palestinian people and the Palestine Liberation Organization, which the Nine feel should be associated with the negotiations.

### Thorn

Having thus defined certain basic principles, the Heads of State or Government took certain operational decisions. They decided to establish contacts with all the parties concerned for the purpose of informing themselves of their position in relation to the principles laid down in that declaration. In the light of the results of this consultation they would then decide on the form that an initiative on their part might take.

It is not for me at this stage to define more precisely the nature and aims of these contacts or the arrangements for establishing them. The Foreign Ministers will come together to discuss them and to make the political arrangements required within the coming fortnight. The implementation of the decisions of the European Council in accordance with arrangements to be worked out jointly will be one of the most important tasks falling on the Presidency during the coming months, in fact, during the coming weeks.

I know that the Venice Declaration has been frequently and vehemently criticized, and there is no point in concealing this. However, since the criticisms are being levelled from all sides, I am not too worried, because this is a sure sign that the position of the Nine is a balanced one. I am also aware of the fact that many doubt the ability and the determination of Europe to play an effective part in settling the Middle East conflict. It will indeed be a difficult task, but that is no reason for us to sit back. It seems to me both essential and praiseworthy to go around all the parties concerned and to see where Europe can be of assistance and where measures can be taken that will help to establish peace. I personally am determined to do my utmost and to give it my very best endeavours without losing any more time. In the light of the results of what I would call a fact-finding mission, it will be for the Community Member States to decide on the form that a possible Community initiative might take.

In the course of a bilateral visit that I made to Iraq and Jordan before the beginning of this Presidency, I had the opportunity to have some preliminary exchanges of views on the problems that will arise in the course of the fact-finding mission that I shall be undertaking at a later stage. Without going into the details of the conversations held, I can tell you straight away that my first impressions were that optimism was justified in the face of the task before us. My observations incline me to believe beyond any shadow of doubt that the Nine were perfectly right to adopt the position taken up in Venice.

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, your Parliament knows that the President-in-Office of the Council is obliged to respect the limits, however narrow, imposed upon him by the timetable of operations in the institutions over which he presides for these six months. Like my predecessors, and for certain reasons perhaps even more than they, I shall be obliged to

observe the rules of collegiality and not to reveal in advance nor to misrepresent the outcome of a discussion currently being held, even when the Parliament reveals its very legitimate desire to be informed in advance of positions taken up by one party or another before any agreement has been reached among the ministers.

I am very well aware that your Assembly may not be entirely satisfied to see such a rule being observed. For your part, however, you are certainly aware that discussions in the Council between representatives of governments requires a certain period of time to have ideas come to fruition and to assess what the Commission defines as the common interest.

The Presidency of the Council confers on the person who exercises it not only the privilege of speaking in a personal capacity but also the duty of saying loud and clear a certain number of things at certain times. I shall avail myself very briefly of this privilege to conclude my statement by making certain personal observations, while of course I also have the right to make a reply at the end of this debate.

As each and every one of you knows, the decisions taken by the Council on 30 May last, particularly in regard to convergence and the budget, are no final solutions to the problem. Sooner or later, as the budget continues to expand, the institutions will again have to tackle comprehensively and even definitively the basic problems of establishing a better balance between different Community policies and allocating to these policies own-resources, whether these are held at their present levels or adapted to changing circumstances.

The Community is facing up to fundamental questions which have a bearing on its own vision of its future development. Certain people would say that we have two years to find solutions and to take the options called for. I would say that the sooner we can find these solutions, the better it will be.

The very nature of the Community will change if it becomes apparent that individual Member States are not prepared to make available to it resources more generous than those they would consider necessary to finance operations in which they detect a direct national interest. If the latter were to be the case, one of the most immediate consequences would undoubtedly be an erosion of Parliament's budgetary powers, which would be reduced to a purely distributive function rather than putting Europe's resources behind new policies and actions.

*(Applause)*

But you will say to me that that is not even the most important thing. The other consequence of all this would be the sterilization of the Community process, deprived of the means of going beyond the limits



## Thorn

imposed on it by the unanimous agreements of the governments and by the decisions already taken.

In the face of all this, I myself personally believe that it is useless to lash out in verbal protests, however unthinkable it is to resign oneself to whatever fate may bring. However, let us also recognize that the financial constraints tying the hands of all the Member States at the present time, and for what may be a rather long future, limit in a very unfortunate fashion the increase in resources that would be needed to make genuine progress within the Community.

We must keep this in mind particularly during the different stages of discussion of the 1981 budget. As I have already said, we will not be able to shape a future common policy by means of the budgetary debate. On the contrary, the budgetary instrument must be refined and made capable of yielding a whole new generation of policies.

In defining these policies, Parliament will play an important part by contributing in a creative spirit to their shaping and implementation. The motto that policies come first does not entail, to my way of thinking, any renunciation of Parliament's budgetary privilege; quite the contrary, and I would wish that you could see it this way.

I should like to issue a solemn warning against the idea put forward by some that we should found new policies on the ruins of Community policies built up over a period of twenty years which have proved their worth. While there is no doubt that the cost of these policies should be reconsidered in the light of criteria possibly better adapted to changing circumstances and new interests, their basic principles must not be called into question. If this were the case, we would scarcely hold out any hope of seeing genuine Community policies take the place of these policies which have lapsed.

The second thought I would put before you has to do with the common energy policy. Not having framed such a policy in good time, and I am thinking here of 1973, we have witnessed the development and consolidation of a number of national policies. In discharging their direct responsibilities to each of their countries, the governments have found themselves obliged to go beyond certain points where the Nine were deadlocked.

I recognize that these national policies are in themselves ideally suited to the objectives they were intended to achieve. However, they inevitably meet the requirements of different nation situations rather than the needs of a single Community market. This difficulty has been alleviated to some extent, but only to some extent, by a concertation procedure pursued within the context of the Council and even by the working out of a number of complementary actions, particularly in the matter of energy savings. The waste

that could have been created by policies basically divergent among themselves has thus happily been limited. However, a genuine Community energy policy is still in a state of abeyance, even though from the very beginning, and I will pay you this tribute, your Parliament has never ceased to call for such a policy.

The coming period will possibly give us a second chance arising from the new awareness of a changing situation brought about in Europe by radical changes in the matter of sources of energy. These changes are such that any plans worked out at a purely national level would have much less chance of being effective and lasting. It thus becomes all the more necessary that a Community policy should be put into operation.

I do not intend to disguise the difficulty of such an undertaking, which become all the more striking when we note the vast differences of opinion between our citizens and our political groupings in regard to the very matter of choosing additional or alternative sources of energy.

Representing as it does the ideas and the interests of all our people, the European Parliament will undoubtedly prove true to its mission by giving this question the absolute priority that it deserves.

This leads me, naturally, to my third and final observation.

The time has gone when public opinion as a whole was prepared to give the Community its undivided allegiance in principle, a blank cheque as it were. Millions of men and woman except from the European institutions a prompt and resolute action going beyond a strictly national context.

We must admit that they have become much more critical in our regard, especially when they compare the enormous resources being employed with the advantages accruing to themselves.

All of us must make an enormous and unprecedented effort inspired by genuine conviction. In building up the new Europe we can never rest on our oars. This effort will be neither credible nor fruitful unless it is backed by growing solidarity within the institutions and unless it results in consistency in our actions and our words, whether these words are spoken by us politicians in Strasbourg, Brussels or Luxembourg, or addressed to our fellow-citizens in our respective countries.

Madam President, there are points of dispute between the institutions, the nature and scope of which are generally misunderstood or worse still misinterpreted, but these points of dispute can be reconciled, because they involve committed people whose only desire is legitimate reaffirmation of rights conferred by the Treaties.

### Thorn

The Community is faced with enormous problems, the vital importance of which must not be concealed behind the natural differences of approach that we all have to the more immediate and more material aspects of the work we have to do. The success of our work as a Community will depend on the continuity and the spirit of open collaboration between our institutions, which will protect Europe from disturbance and crisis.

In any case, Madam President, I for my part shall strive to fulfil my mandate in this spirit. It is my determination to do everything in my power not to disappoint the hopes reposed in this grand adventure which is the building up of Europe, which for me is the noblest work of our times. It is my ambition to be understood and my hope to be convincing.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Glinne.** — *(F)* Madam President, Mr President-in-Office, may I first of all congratulate our former colleague — and a colleague of long standing at that — the new President of the Council, on his interesting statement, to which I listened very attentively. It touched upon all the Community problems and those relating to political cooperation which are so much on our minds at the moment. We ourselves share many of the anxieties expressed by Mr Thorn and many of the points made by him coincide with our own views. In the area of political cooperation, I endorse what he said, for example, about Lomé II, the Euro-Arab Dialogue, the North-South Dialogue, about the importance of having a satisfactory development strategy, about the Madrid Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, about the Middle East, and indeed about Afghanistan. As regards the Community's internal affairs, we agree with Mr Thorn that it is quite deplorable that the formulation of a proper Community energy policy should be left in abeyance when really it ought to have been given priority as a matter of course.

This is not to say that we go along with all that the President of the Council had to tell us, or that we heard all that we wanted to hear from him. Far from it. I am bound to say, in fact, on behalf of the Socialist Group, that we have certain misgivings about the policies being contemplated and one or two criticisms to make of them.

We have misgivings about the wisdom of the energy policy being advocated by the Council. Misgivings also about the unemployment problem and the hitherto apparent lack of political will to really come to grips with it, even though it is in our view the No. 1 problem — more urgent even than the fight against inflation. And misgivings, finally, about certain aspects of the problem of the threat to peace. As regards energy

policy and the systematic recourse to a nuclear solution — it seems quite clear that this is a line that the Council is determined to pursue — I must repeat once again that we in the Socialist Group attach a great deal of importance to safety. In this connection, our group has quite recently gone on record to express its utter dismay at the Council's rejection of the 'Seveso' directive. In this matter the Council has unfortunately taken the same line as the French Government, which rejects any attempt to compel Member States, through the instrument of a directive, to provide information of an international character concerning dangerous industrial activities. We feel, however, that such a directive is an essential step if accidents on an even greater scale than those at Seveso and Flixborough are to be prevented. The rejection of this proposal only serves to confirm our reservations concerning the development of nuclear energy and strengthen us in our determination that there should be no development of nuclear energy until complete safety is guaranteed. Incidentally, Mr President-in-Office, still on the subject of energy, I was delighted to hear you say that every encouragement should also be given to investments in research into and development of new alternative energy sources, especially oil and gas synthesized from coal.

My group would have liked, however, to see this wish reflected in the 1980 budget estimates. Unfortunately, this is not the case. Our amendments to this effect have not been accepted. But I tell you here and now that we shall be taking this matter up again in the 1981 budget procedure because we simply are not prepared to be fobbed off with promises and declarations of intent. We want to see some positive action along these lines and for that we obviously need to have the necessary resources entered in the budget. More than that, Mr President-in-Office, there has to be evidence of real political will and the required instruments must be made available to ensure our self-sufficiency in energy.

I would remind you once again — and I am very sorry indeed to have to bring this up on the occasion of every Council statement — that the Socialist Group put forward concrete proposals on this matter as long ago as the part-session of July 1979. These proposals included, among others, the setting up of a European Energy Agency, one of the purposes of which would be to monitor the activities of the multinational oil companies and to find a Community solution, and it really must be a Community solution, to the problem of safeguarding our supplies. I am not optimistic about what the Council of Ministers of the Nine proposes eventually to do about these specific proposals, formulated by our group a year ago, as there is no evidence of even a preliminary study having been put in hand.

I should like to move on now to what you said, Mr President of the Council, with reference to the budget for 1980. You expressed considerable satisfaction at the conclusion of the budgetary procedure for the

Glinne

current year, and in your view the Council bent over backwards on this occasion.

The Socialist Group is quite unable to share your satisfaction. We accept that certain improvements to the 1980 budget have been introduced since the end of last year. We also recognize the fact that the Council has taken account of amendments adopted by a majority in Parliament — I say majority because often the vote went against us — in the sittings of 26 and 27 June in Luxembourg. It does not alter the fact, though, that certain amendments that we in the Socialist Group regarded as fundamental — I am speaking principally about the amendments tabled by the Social Affairs Committee concerning the steel industry, measures to combat poverty and a programme in favour of women, and also those tabled by the Committee on Development and Cooperation on the problem of food aid — were rejected by a parliamentary majority. Obviously, the Council as such cannot be blamed for this rejection, even though no doubt it was pleased about it, but the President-in-Office will understand that, under the circumstances, the Socialist Group has no cause to rejoice.

I should also add — indeed, Mr Thorn, you referred to it yourself in your statement — that we feel very strongly about the need for a radical restructuring of the budget.

Speaking about certain problems that you quite rightly regard as fundamental, you said that we have two years in which to find some solutions and that no doubt we should act more speedily. For several years now, in point of fact, the automatic growth of certain agricultural expenditure, connected with the dairy surpluses, has led to a relative reduction of the Community's own resources. The Commission has promised to submit proposals for restructuring the budget by the summer of 1981. Although this undertaking has been greeted with general satisfaction in many quarters — in fact, only last night I heard Prime Minister Raymond Barre saying on French television how delighted he was on that score — I wish to point out that this would mean that these vital measures could not effectively be implemented before the 1982 budget. As far as we are concerned, we should like to see these changes introduced, as far as possible, in the budget for 1981, which will be coming before us shortly and to which we are already devoting a great deal of thought. Make no mistake, this budget is sure to lead to yet another major confrontation. We ourselves believe that from now on we must look at the budget in terms of the need for a radical restructuring, within a multi-annual framework, coupled with an overall policy that will ensure a greater degree of convergence between the economic policies being pursued within the Community. Without wishing in any way to appear alarmist, we believe that the own-resources crisis and the failure to carry through the policy of budget restructuring together threaten

the very survival of the Community. We would not, for example, want to see non-compulsory expenditure squeezed out as a result of mounting economic pressures.

At this point I should like to address a specific question to the President-in-Office as a Luxembourgger. In an interview he gave on 5 July to the Belgian newspaper 'Le Soir', Mr Werner, President of the Luxembourg Government said, with particular reference to the budget question: 'It is of course the intention to alter the balance between agriculture and other sections of the Community budget, so as to tilt it in favour of new policies. But, despite every effort, this is bound ultimately to result in unforeseen expenditure. Now, we are almost at a point where the Community's resources are fully stretched and Luxembourg, among other countries, is not in favour of any increase in the percentage of VAT going to own-resources beyond the present 1 %. However, stalemates of this kind have a way of stimulating the imagination and perhaps this may help us to find resources where we might not otherwise have expected to do so.'

I shall not dwell on some of the contradictions between Mr Werner's remarks and your own and go on to ask my question: If the Nine decided against any increase in the 1 % share of resources from VAT and if, despite a radical restructuring of the budget, it turned out that additional resources absolutely had to be found, what would be the nature of these unforeseen resources that the President of the Government of the Grand Duchy referred to? I hope that you will be able to shed a little light on this point.

Mr President, I should like now, if I may, to give you our reactions to what you had to say concerning the European Monetary System. It is a pity that you had to leave us in the air as regards the second phase of the EMS. We should have liked to know more about the Council's progress with the European Monetary Fund, with the ECU, and with coordination between the monetary policies of the Nine and those of the United States. We appreciate that these things present enormously difficult technical problems, but at the same time they have far-reaching political implications. Furthermore, in that interview I mentioned earlier in 'Le Soir', the Luxembourg Prime Minister is a little more specific because he says that the Nine will have to declare whether or not they are prepared to move on to the second phase of the European Monetary System in March of next year. It is essential, he says, 'to expedite the work on setting up a European Monetary Fund, the decision on which was taken 18 months ago.' 'It is probable,' he goes on to say, 'that this point will be on the agenda of the next European Council, which should be meeting in Luxembourg some time during the last quarter.' I should like therefore to have some more information on this matter and, while we are on the subject, I am sorry that you should have dealt so superficially with two problems that are of such paramount importance in the field of interna-

Glinne

tional liquidity, namely the problem of controlling the Euro-currency market on the one hand, and the problem of recycling petrodollars on the other. These two problems, which are among the principal factors underlying the economic malaise currently affecting the Western world, were scarcely touched on in your statement, and then almost in passing.

Madam President, Mr President-in-Office, I mentioned my Group's grave concern over the appalling problem of unemployment which, we believe, is far more urgent than the problem of inflation. With regard to the unemployment crisis, you said that the Luxembourg Presidency intends to make every effort to continue and expand the dialogue with both sides of industry at Community level, in particular within the Standing Committee on Employment. I was delighted to hear you say this and we welcome your declaration of intent wholeheartedly. You should understand, however, that we attach a great deal of importance not only to the Standing Committee on Employment but also to an urgent resumption of the tripartite conferences. The last Council of Social Affairs Ministers at the beginning of June succeeded in thawing somewhat the atmosphere between the parties concerned. We believe we must have a return to these tripartite conferences and that their object should be to formulate agreements that are binding on employers and workers, and also on the Member States. We should also very much like to see collective agreements at EEC level being negotiated and signed in certain key sectors. The ETUC has suggested, for example, that collective agreements of this kind could be negotiated in half a dozen or so sectors, including the automotive, glass and textile industries. On a more general note, Mr President-in-Office, we ask the Council to take more notice of the ETUC's recommendations, particularly on the problem of reducing working hours. As you know, the representations made by the ETUC to the Council in Venice unfortunately came to nothing. This failure aroused intense frustration and it is vital that a solution be found.

Mr President, you spoke to us about our policy towards the United Nations and, earlier in your statement, about your desire to improve conciliation between the Council and Parliament. Which leads me to a very specific question that I should like to put to you concerning the second United Nations world conference on the position of women being held in Copenhagen from 14 July. We read in the press that it is intended to send two observers from the European Parliament to the conference, which is fine if that is indeed true. I have to tell you, however, that the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Women's Rights has still not had any official notification of this intention, so perhaps you could tell us if a decision to this effect has indeed been made or if it is simply a piece of journalistic licence.

On behalf of the Socialist Group I welcome your remarks concerning the entry of Spain and Portugal into the European Community. I was equally pleased to hear the French Prime Minister, Mr Barre, speaking out in support of this integration, in contrast to views expressed earlier by President Giscard d'Estaing.

The Socialist Group, in line with the position outlined in a press release in Germany last week from the Bureau of the Confederation of Socialist Parties of the European Community, reaffirms its belief that the enlargement of the Community cannot now be brought into question. The timetable agreed upon with each of the applicant states must be adhered to, whilst of course protecting the interests of all the parties concerned. These can be considered during the transitional periods and negotiations, which is what they are for. But the main thing is for us to honour the undertakings we gave to the democratic movements that were only just beginning to emerge, still under the yoke of oppressive dictatorships, in Portugal and Spain.

And now just a brief word about the North-South Dialogue and political cooperation in the aftermath of the Venice Summit. We Socialists attach enormous importance to this North-South Dialogue, which you quite rightly covered in your statement. May I draw your attention to the fact that the President of the Socialist International, our own colleague Willy Brandt, and the Commission which bears his name, have drawn up an excellent report on the subject and we hope that it will be given positive consideration.

As regards the Middle East, we listened to what you said with interest and approval. You indicated that contacts should be set up with all the parties concerned without too much delay. You have in fact restated the philosophy of the Venice Summit and you also said that you have laid down the groundwork for a contact mission that you intend to undertake at a later date. Which means that you are taking the responsibility for extremely heavy and delicate personal initiatives in this area entirely on your own shoulders.

While on the subject, I should like to sound you out about certain rumours that are circulating in the Netherlands concerning a proposal to appoint a sort of special ambassador, or plenipotentiary, of the Nine who would initiate contacts of the kind you have described with all the interested parties, but at a very early date.

Coming now to the problem of Iran, I feel bound to take issue with you on one or two points. You have gone on record as saying that, in your view, not until after the hostages have been released will the positive aspects of the Islamic revolution in Iran be seen in their true light and only then will it be possible to restore the traditional links between Iran and Europe.

Glinne

As I say, we would not be quite so categorical, although we of course utterly condemn the taking of hostages at the United States embassy in Tehran, so long ago now, as indeed we would condemn any similar taking of hostages if it happened at the Soviet embassy there. But, getting back to the essential points contained in a resolution that we tabled, but which sadly did not win a majority in Parliament, we believe that we cannot afford to forget the horror of the human rights violations that took place under the Shah's regime. We must remember that it is the indefensible right of the Iranian nation to exploit its resources primarily for its own benefit. We must stress the interdependence of all the peoples involved and avoid turning a blind eye to all but one particular aspect of the situation.

It was this resolution that led to three Socialists of world prominence, Mr Bruno Kreisky, Chancellor of Austria, Felipe Gonzales, the well-known Spanish political leader, and Olof Palme, Sweden's former Prime Minister, to undertake a mission to Tehran where they held some very useful talks.

It was also this same resolution that paved the way for the Iranian Minister for Foreign Affairs to join in discussions with our most senior representatives at the meeting of the Socialist International in Oslo a few weeks ago. We believe this was not only useful but also necessary. We must keep the lines of communication open, as much as anything in order to secure the release of the hostages. This is infinitely preferable to any show of strength, because any such show of strength is futile, irrational and irresponsible, particularly when, for example, one of the Member States takes up the running and then drops out of it.

Mr President, I should also like '*in cauda venenum*' perhaps, but at any rate quite openly, to raise two further problems. You made repeated references to the hopes you have for the Commission. You said the Council was expecting to receive from the Commission proposals on energy; you are also awaiting their proposals on telematics; and on restructuring the budget — let us hope they will be to hand before June 1981.

As President of the Council, assuming you remain in office, you will be receiving summary analyses from retiring Commissioners. Since we have both been Members of the former Parliament together, and for a very long time, perhaps you will allow me to put a direct question to you. You are in fact now President-designate of the Commission of the European Communities. This is common knowledge and we are delighted that this is so, even though the appointment has not yet been finally confirmed. We would like you as soon as possible to become either full-time President of the Council or full-time President of the Commission. We say this because we consider that the President of the Commission needs to devote himself

to important procedural discussions with the governments of the Member States and with his new Commissioners, and because we expect the new President of the Commission of the European Communities to come before Parliament with a declaration of intent which can then be followed by a debate. Enormously gifted though you are, as everyone knows, I believe it is too much to expect for Gaston Thorn, President of the Council, to confer with Gaston Thorn, President of the Commission. Besides, we hope that you will very soon be taking up your duties as President of the Commission.

One final question, and this is where the '*in cauda venenum*' comes in, about what your Prime Minister, Mr Werner, refers to as 'the battle of the seats'. For the third time I am quoting from his interview with '*Le Soir*':

'With the Community facing such fundamental difficulties, this is hardly the time to raise this particular problem. However, if I had to — for example if I was specifically asked by the European Parliament — I would say as follows: In the first place, the matter of seats lies within the jurisdiction of the national governments. Secondly, the Luxembourg compromise arrived at in 1965 clearly established the system that operates at the moment. For my part, I think it is wrong to draw a semantic distinction between seats, which would place them under the jurisdiction of the governments, and places of work, which would place them within the jurisdiction of the Members of Parliament. Any such distinction would constitute a deviation from the text agreed in 1965 and annexed to the Merger Treaty.'

I hope that this statement is a misquotation by the journalist rather than a misconception on the part of its author. In any event, I should like to make one thing clear: our Group — and indeed a resolution to the same effect was tabled by Mr Seefeld several months ago — wants the governments of the Member States, whose responsibility it is according to Article 216 of the Treaty, to stir themselves out of their torpor and finally make a decision concerning the seat — notice I say seat, not seats — of the Community institutions. And this seat — note the singular again — is very different to the seats that the Luxembourg Prime Minister spoke of so confusingly. Having drawn this essential distinction concerning places of work, may I say quite simply, without wishing to start any argument here but nevertheless with deep conviction, that the European Parliament, which is very much involved in this question, should be allowed the last word. Its opinion should carry regardless of any lobby, regardless of any national interest, regardless of any question of prestige, regardless of any possible repercussions.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Madam President, I would join with the last speaker in saying how glad I am to welcome the President-in-Office here and to listen to his speech, which covered a very great many subjects. Quite obviously there is not time for me to go into all of them, but I would like to congratulate him on his presentation of them to us, because they undoubtedly cover all the issues which are of importance to us today. They range from the situation in the Middle East to the difficulties over the budget and various other problems facing us in the Community.

But I must say to the President-in-Office, after having listened to his speech, and I am sure he will not misunderstand me, that the road to hell is paved with good intentions, and there are an awful lot of good intentions in his speech. I hope over the coming weeks and months we will see a little more precision regarding those various good intentions which he laid on the line today. However, it would be churlish of me to lay too much stress on that aspect, because I welcome very much the initiatives that were taken in Venice and particularly what the President-in-Office has said today concerning the Middle East. And I sincerely hope that those initiatives which he has already taken and those which he will be taking in the coming months will bear fruit.

I must say that the question which Mr Glinne has just put to him concerning what his actual role is to be in the coming months is, of course, in this context an extremely important one. Whether he will be acting as President of Council for the six months or as President-designate of the Commission is something that we in this House would want to know, particularly in relation to the initiatives which he mentioned need to be taken concerning the Middle East. I think it is only right for this House to hear his views on this particular point.

I shall now turn, if I may, to two other issues which are as important as any I am going to touch on. They concern, first of all, energy. The President-in-Office is right to place the great emphasis on it that he did. On the subject of energy conservation, all kinds of experts have written and spoken to me concerning what will happen even with a modest increase in the GNP of the Community over the next 20 years. By the turn of the century, there is bound to be a very considerable energy gap and very severe and stringent measures will have to be taken. However, if the necessary measures are not put into effect now, if during the next six months we do not begin to see what they should be and how they should be applied, our efforts will come too late. I do not believe that we have sufficient resources of coal or oil within the Community, let alone within my own country, to satisfy our energy needs. I would ask him therefore to consider this problem and to come to us at the earliest opportunity with whatever plans he and the Commission may have to increase output in this field. I believe that the problems

inherent in developing the nuclear sector, whether it be fusion or fission, are very substantial and I welcome his comments on this, but I beg of him not to underestimate the considerable problems mentioned by the honourable gentlemen opposite concerning safety in this field and would point out that a great deal of research and development needs to be done here and a great deal of money spent. I should like him to come forward within the next six months with concrete plans in this field.

The last matter I should like to raise concerns the budget for 1981. I pray that we shall have the 1980 budget over and done with by tomorrow evening. We shall then have to concentrate on the 1981 budget, and, as the President himself said in his speech, the issues that confronted us have not gone away, they are still there. We need a great deal of thought and a great deal of flexibility in our approach to this matter. I give him fair warning that my group will not accept again the kind of balance which existed in the 1980 budget. We cannot accept any repetition of this in the 1981 budget. The balance between agriculture and the other sections of the budget has got to be altered. We hope that, following the agreement reached in Brussels under the chairmanship of President Colombo, the undertaking to restructure the CAP is a really genuine one and that work on this restructuring will be started with the Commission and the Council in all seriousness during his six months' Presidency. I hope this will be so, because I say to him quite clearly that there has got to be new thinking concerning this budget. Moreover, we must not return to the old bad habits of having a budget presented to us which includes some rather imaginary figures for agriculture. The actual budget itself, together with the price proposals for the coming agricultural year, must be coordinated. The past practice of presenting enormous estimates later on, meaning supplementary budgets, is a method which will not be tolerable in 1981. We had it properly done in 1980, although the result was not necessarily what we would have wished, so let us be quite certain that in 1981 we do not fall back into the old bad habits.

Nevertheless, I welcome the President-in-Office and I wish him well in whatever task he decides to undertake over the next six months. I am quite certain that he will execute it extremely efficiently and I am quite certain that whoever takes over from him will indeed further the aims and desires of this Community. My final word, Mr President, is that we look forward during this six months to a positive approach to the problems of the Community. We have marked time up to now but cannot afford to do so any more. We must go forward. I look to him and his colleagues to see that we do that very thing.

*(Applause from the right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Berlinguer to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

**Mr Berlinguer.** — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the crisis of the European Community has become so far-reaching in its implications that it is difficult to imagine its survival for long under the present conditions. We have reached a point of no return: either we advance the process of integration through vigorous new action or we face the risk — indeed the certainty — of decline and disintegration of the Community. I must say that I found no trace of an awareness of this fact, of this dilemma, in the speech made by Mr Thorn, however diligent, competent and measured some of his observations may have been.

The last six months have counted among the most troubled in the history of the Community. On some occasions the limit of paralysis and breakdown has been reached or even passed. The Italian Presidency — and I regret this fact even if I belong to a party which is vigorously opposed to the present government in my own country — has done nothing to begin to remove the underlying causes of the situation now facing the Community. The much-vaunted compromise arrived at with the United Kingdom, which consisted in reality in giving that country everything it had asked for, has certainly not helped to bring about solutions to the Community's internal problems which have merely been postponed and aggravated.

The facts speak for themselves. They are well-known and have often been the subject of critical comment in this House. There are close on seven million unemployed in our nine countries; inflation is rising; production is moving into recession; imbalances in development are widening to the detriment of the weakest regions and countries. Despite all this, the percentage of expenditure on agriculture, consisting, as we all know, almost entirely of funds required to support prices and to a minimal degree of money earmarked for a policy of structural renewal, has risen to 74 % of the total budget in 1980.

This merely highlights the inability of the Community institutions — beginning with the Council of Ministers and the governments of the nine countries — to implement a policy of renewal necessarily entailing common action in the economic sector, in energy policy and so forth. This action has not been taken, despite all the fine words and undertakings which seem unrealistic, given the fact that the Community's own resources will shortly be exhausted.

Why has progress not been made with the definition and implementation of common policies? In our view, the reason is that the dominant economic and political groups have an interest in free markets and free trade — which has up to now been the main feature of the process of integration — but do not have an equal interest in the adoption of common policies designed

to attain the objective of more balanced and more equitable economic and social development throughout the Community.

This merely serves to confirm our deep conviction that we need decisive reforms to break out of the crisis by advancing the process of integration accompanied by renewal of the present economic and social structures — reforms in the life and workings of the European institutions; but the decisive step to be taken involves a full commitment on the part of the working classes. This is one reason for which we must emphatically seek all possible understanding with the forces, parties and social organizations founded on the working classes and peoples of our continent.

There is a further vital need: that of making decisive progress towards full affirmation of the specific, independent role of Europe in the world. We welcome the importance attached by Mr Thorn to political cooperation, but it remains a fact that the only major independent act of the Community has been the Venice declaration, in particular the section affirming the need to involve the Palestine Liberation Organization in efforts to attain a solution to the Middle East problem.

Other initiatives have come not from the Community but from certain Member States. They have demonstrated the prospects existing today for a European initiative in world politics. How do we envisage such an initiative? Ladies and gentlemen, in recent months we have repeatedly debated events marking a rapid deterioration in the international situation. The events in Iran, the intensification of the planned deployment of nuclear missiles, the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan, the proposed and actual acts of retaliation against the Soviet Union and Iran. Faced with this deterioration in the situation which involves as the most serious risk the growing opposition between the two superpowers, two divergent positions have emerged in the Community, in the Atlantic Alliance and in our Parliament: the first position is that of those bodies of opinion who give total support to the line of the present American administration and see a need for a trial of strength and punitive retaliation. The second position is, on the contrary, inspired by a conviction that none of the outstanding conflicts and problems — a reduction of armaments, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan and the return of the American hostages — can be resolved without a contribution to a reduction in the tension between the two super-powers, the two great blocs. This tension serves merely to make positions more rigid and to heighten divergences; it bears within it a disastrous logic leading towards nuclear conflict. We must therefore condemn all violations of international laws and demand respect for these laws without ever interrupting the dialogue and negotiations.

**Berlinguer**

That position has in recent months through various initiatives and in different ways gained the support of many non-aligned countries, and also of other forces and governments which, even within the Atlantic Alliance and in a spirit of respect for their commitments, have still managed to resist the injunctions and pressure of the United States, through a conviction that negotiations and detente are the necessary condition and the most solid base for security in Europe and in all international relations.

May I remind you that this is the line which we have coherently supported and on the basis of which our action has been developed in Italy and in Europe, to say nothing of many contacts outside our continent.

Chancellor Schmidt's visit to Moscow, which, surprisingly enough, did not even earn a mention by Mr Thorn, proves that this approach is both correct and practicable. After months of tension there has at last been a first overture with the possibility of fresh negotiations on the reduction of forces, an overture which demonstrates, at the more general level, that negotiations are also possible to solve the other more serious and explosive problems of North-South relations. Here the European Community has an essential role to play if it is able to act with the strength derived from political unity.

We are now on the eve of the Madrid Conference and it is in the deepest interests of Europe for this event to clear the way for new progress in all areas of East-West cooperation through fuller application by all the parties of the commitments given in the Helsinki Final Act. We would urge the Council of Ministers and the Luxembourg Presidency to ensure that the Nine, in the framework of political cooperation, define a positive and outward-looking for the Madrid Conference; finally this Parliament should be informed in good time to enable it to debate the guidelines which the Nine propose to follow.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Lecanuet to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

**Mr Lecanuet.** — *(F)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, the year that has passed — we are after all being asked to take stock to some extent — since the election of the European Parliament by universal suffrage has seen opposition grow in one Member State of the Community to the basic rules which have governed the functioning of the common market until now. This crisis, important enough in itself, has been joined by the budget war, which will now soon, we hope at least, be brought to its conclusion.

Thus, in the eyes of the public, the first year of the term of office of the European Parliament, while bringing new vigour to the construction of Europe, has coincided with a feeling that Europe has been passing through a crisis.

We feel that we must do everything in our power to prevent European policy from becoming a strategy of brinkmanship, which paralyses the Community's forward movement by causing confrontation between the various institutions created to cooperate one with the other in the Community. Why must we avoid this dangerous strategy, of which the public has so little awareness? First and foremost, for the sake of the construction of Europe in itself. And then because international events are too serious for Europe to show its weaknesses, while in Moscow and elsewhere the Communist strategy is focused specifically on divisions in Europe for the development of its offensive, in opposition to the fundamental interests of the free democracies. And lastly because the public is completely at a loss — to judge from what I see in my own country at least — to understand the squabbles over procedure and the arguments between Parliament, the Council and the Commission about terms of reference. If this impression continued for long, the result would be, I fear, a weakening of the European ideal, and this would reduce the popular support that our institution needs.

It seems to us, therefore, that we must all endeavour to give ourselves a better image and to restore hope to the millions of citizens who have placed their trust in us.

So I will come straight to what seems to me essential. The Community must regain its cohesion, shake off its sluggishness and break the yoke that is hampering its operation. I shall briefly discuss the aspects which show that the time has come for Europe to play more fully its proper role in the world.

Firstly, I should like to say something about the need for Europe to be given back its cohesion. The agreement of 30 May of this year on the British contribution to the budget and agricultural prices has the merit that it exists. But it has done no more than largely postpone the difficulties rather than resolving them. The agreement of 30 May should be more than a break, a gap between two crises. The fact remains that the Nine have noted that the increase in agricultural support spending is the outcome of structural surpluses in certain products, and that consequently this increase in spending must be slowed down. It is the outcome of the poor functioning of the rules, which in themselves are still good rules. It is much to the credit of our Parliament that it has made people more aware now of the need for adjustment in the common agricultural policy. These adjustments and the British contribution are linked: both should encourage us to make of the Community budget the



Lecanuet

instrument of a more determined policy, one that is adapted more closely to its objectives, and one that is capable of correcting the excessive imbalances that have come to light over the years. No one, we hope, will agree to the abandonment of the basic rules of the common agricultural policy, which remains the only true Community policy. But no one disputes that Europe needs new common policies, which, if they are to be implemented, will require substantial financial resources.

How are we to break out of the circle of the twofold concern to preserve what has been achieved with the agricultural policy without overly increasing public spending? If the Member States refuse in the next two years to increase the Community's own resources, we shall face two equally unacceptable solutions: reducing the Community to no more than an agricultural organization or reducing farmers' standards of living so that new policies may be developed. We must therefore try to get out of this *impasse*. The only way out is upwards, if I may put it that way, by proving that the introduction of new, dynamic policies at Community level will benefit the Community as a whole.

In this respect, I am thinking first and foremost of the energy policy. The national parliaments will not agree to new financial transfers, to an increase, for example, in the VAT percentage, unless the new Community policies appear more efficient and more economical than national policies. It is therefore for Parliament to show that this is the case as soon as possible and as convincingly as possible. Adjustments to the financial mechanisms and to the agricultural policy are all the more urgently required as the enlargement of the Community depends on them. For both Spain and Portugal entry into the European Community is an extremely important goal, and it is a goal of the utmost importance for the whole of the Community. For the European Community, Spain's and Portugal's entry will strengthen pluralistic democracy, what I have called the 'democracies of freedom', as opposed to the so-called people's democracies. Let us not forget, furthermore, that Spain and Portugal, on the south-west flank of Western Europe, occupy a strategic position of importance for our own security. Very many of us are therefore convinced that the democratic stabilization of the Iberian peninsula and the enlargement of the European Community stem from the same principles and are closely linked: safeguarding peace and the liberty of the democracies of freedom.

(Applause)

We must therefore do everything to ensure that the restoration to order of the European Community's financial rules and of the common agricultural policy does not delay the enlargement of our Community. The deliberations now beginning among the Member States should therefore extend to the needs of Spain

and Portugal as candidates for accession to the Community until such time as they have developed sufficiently to become full members. And the principle which must inspire both of us — the present Member States of the Community and the applicants for membership — is that of active solidarity based on common values of civilization. To make it clear that we appreciate the political importance of the steps taken by Lisbon and Madrid, I should like to see the nine governments of the European Community considering as soon as possible the inclusion of the governments of Spain and Portugal in European political cooperation.

Although Parliament is quite naturally predestined to make a basic contribution to the profound deliberations now in progress, the role of the Commission and its President will be no less vital. The greatest service the European Parliament can do the Community institutions is to strengthen the responsibility, authority and independence of the Commission. The Commission performs unique functions in a community of States which are, of course, sovereign, but which — and let us not forget this — are linked by their commitment freely given to place the collective interests of Europe above national egoism. Robert Schuman's inventiveness consisted specifically in giving birth to a body known as 'the Commission', which had no equivalent or precedent in the traditional international organizations. The Commission has one very important feature, which it must preserve and which we must encourage: independence, now more than ever indissociable from the credibility of the proposals put forward by the Commission as part of its right of initiative, making it the prime mover in the European Community. Without trust, ladies and gentlemen, the pursuit of joint action is a hopeless task, fading before the sterile imperative of 'every man for himself'.

Our support for the independence of the role played by the Commission, in the interests of Europe and to ensure that the Community institutions function as smoothly as possible, cannot be questioned. We hope to see the spirit of loyalty maintained and strengthened in the Commission, which will have 14 Members from 1 January 1981 and which, taking account of the political balance emerging in our Parliament, must above all continue to give as unified an expression as possible of the overriding interest of the Community. We call on it to take the necessary action, such as that suggested in the report of the 'Three Wise Men', to ensure that the administration of the Commission becomes the instrument best suited to cope with the tasks that await it.

To conclude and summarize my thoughts on this aspect: a strengthened and rejuvenated Commission, a Parliament which has found its rhythm and organized its activities under its revised Rules of Procedure, a European Council which focuses its decisions on defining the main political lines of the Community, a

Lecanuet

Council of Ministers which is readier to accept its responsibility and confines to the most extreme cases the use of the veto by one of its members, that broadly is how we want to see the institutions working.

Before concluding I should like to say a few words about the need for a clearer assertion of Europe's strength so that it may exercise its influence in the world. The world has reached the brink of one of the most critical situations since the end of the Korean War. East-West tension is taking over from North-South tension. And Europe, is at the centre of this twofold division. It may be, if the disaster occurs, its first victim. It is a potential battlefield, and we shall all be involved if it comes to conflict. It is vulnerable to the interruption of the supplies of raw materials and energy it needs. It is also vulnerable to the possible breaking of the maritime links it uses for its foreign trade.

How are we to transform this weakness into strength for the sake of peace? By doing everything possible to make Europe the partner without whom any lasting settlement is impossible. The Lomé II Convention, now in the process of ratification, bears witness to Europe's ability and will to establish, in exemplary fashion, new relations of solidarity between the industrialized countries and the developing countries. In the Middle East, as the European initiative taken by the European Council in Venice has shown, in international political and economic relations, in the North-South Dialogue, Europe can and must increasingly play the role of a leading actor on the international stage. To this end, it has a considerable asset in its hands: its economic and commercial weight in the world. If it wants to, it can also mobilize the historical, cultural, human and technological resources to ensure that no continent, no people in the world, is indifferent to what Europe says and does.

But Europe will not make its influence felt and will not be able to defend its interest unless two conditions are fulfilled. The first of these conditions is that it must increasingly speak with one voice and never give the outside world the impression that it can be divided. We are very pleased with the considerable progress made in political cooperation, and we hope this process will continue. Has the time not come to consider setting up a centre for deliberations on foreign policy along the lines suggested not so long ago in Mr Tindemans's report? I am personally convinced that Europe will not overcome its agricultural problems and its political problems unless it decides one day to give itself a coordinated defence policy so that it can itself contribute to its security.

If Europe wants to reduce its exposure to external pressures and if it wants to reduce the tension being caused more and more openly by the Soviet Union, it must think about its defence capacity and decide to establish a security policy. I would find it inadmissible and incomprehensible for free Europe to abandon the

protection for which it realistically had to appeal after the Second World War in favour of domination to which it would submit through weakness and a lack of foresight. There is no point in drawing a parallel between the United States and the Soviet Union and placing the two super-powers back to back. Europe is proud to belong to the Atlantic and Mediterranean community of free nations. But it is time for Europe to seek to place the alliance on two equal pillars, equal in law and one day, I hope, in resources. The time has come for Europe to assert itself in the world, unless we are to resign ourselves to self-effacement. It is not, at all events, a risk that the group on whose behalf I have the honour to speak is ready to take.

Europe will be respected if it makes the necessary effort to ensure its security. Détente is not a state of mind. Détente can survive only if it is based on a balance of forces until disarmament takes effect. We say yes to détente between East and West, but not to the disintegration of the free world, since détente can only be based on firstly the closest union possible among the European countries and then Europe's alliance with the United States, an alliance founded on the two pillars I have briefly attempted to define.

Resignation, retreat before force, the absence of deep faith in one's own values have never led to anything but the slow disappearance of peoples or even their violent annihilation. We need only consider the martyred peoples to convince ourselves of this need.

To conclude, what Europeans have in common, whether they are Socialists or Christian Democrats, Conservatives or Liberals, is surely a certain vision of man, of man's moral dignity, of man's physical dignity which leaves no room for gulags or fetters. What we all have in common is that we consider the human person to be unique, irreplaceable and, in our Christian-Democratic eyes, sacrosanct. That is the heritage which we have in common and define through human rights. Parliament has resolutely committed itself to the struggle to defend human rights. That is its honourable duty and its vocation. Nothing that happens in Afghanistan, Vietnam or El Salvador — or elsewhere under right-wing or left-wing dictatorships — is unfamiliar to those who meet in Strasbourg, because the popular legitimacy we derive from our election by universal suffrage unites us, beyond the limits of the powers which we respect and which are defined in the Treaties, in solidarity which all peoples linked with the cause of democracy, anywhere in the world where this cause is threatened. Faced with the challenge of a difficult world, a dangerous world, we hope that the European Parliament will make the voice of our people heard loud and clear, because our peoples want the union of Europe, they want to contribute to progress towards the organization of a cohesive, united and responsible Community. This is the task to which we for our part are determined to devote ourselves.

**President.** — I call Mr Rey to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Rey.** — (*F*) Madam President, Mr President-in-Office of the Council, ladies and gentlemen, in speaking on behalf of my friends I shall surprise no one by expressing pleasure at seeing Mr Thorn once again occupying the lofty position of President of the Council and the feeling of confidence with which we welcome his presence at the head of one of the great institutions of the Community. We have listened with great interest to the statement he has just made on the programme of the Luxembourg Presidency. We appreciated its realism and active conviction. It was too wide-ranging to allow an analysis in a few minutes. But we particularly appreciated what was said about the role of our Parliament, especially in so important a field as political cooperation, and the need for collaboration among the institutions of the Community.

I intend today to concentrate in the Community's institutional problems, which will take up a great deal of our Assembly's time over the next six months. I shall not dwell on the Commission; Parliament debated that aspect during its May part-session. I should like to say to Mr Thorn how pleased we are that it is in him, a representative of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, that general confidence is placed. I would remind him that Parliament hopes its Political Affairs Committee will soon have the opportunity of a thorough discussion with the President-designate of the Commission on his programme as the future President of the Commission, rather than waiting until the Commission is complete and the Assembly eventually has its grand investiture debate to express its confidence. As regards Parliament's powers, we shall shortly be discussing their present level and their extension, particularly in the legislative sphere. This principle was recognized by our Heads of State or Government as long ago as their deliberations of 10 December 1974 in Paris. You are more familiar than anyone Mr President, with those deliberations, since you took part in them and made a personal contribution to their outcome. We hope that under your Presidency this extension of Parliament's powers will become a matter of fact, with our needing to await the amendment of the text of the Treaties to establish that extension in law.

What I would particularly like to discuss with you, Mr President, if I may be so bold, is the functioning of the Council. Without a doubt it must be admitted straightaway that it has the most difficult task. The national ministers who form the Council, accountable to their own parliaments and exposed to pressure groups in their own countries, have the trouble of reconciling the interests of the Member States they represent with the general interests of the Community as a whole. This should be remembered from the outset, when criticism is levelled at the work of the Council. This having been said, the remarks that follow may seem

more acceptable from one who for four years was a member of the special Council of Ministers of the European Coal and Steel Community, who on three occasions chaired its proceedings, who worked in close cooperation with the Council in the ten years he was a European Commissioner and the three years he was President of the Commission and who will be leaving the European Parliament at the end of this July part-session, with the result that these observations have all the marks of a political farewell.

I have three points to which I would draw your attention. The first concerns the famous Luxembourg compromise of February 1966, after which it became the Council's habit, on a scale unforeseen at the outset to take its decisions unanimously. It is a subject with which you are too familiar to make further explanation necessary. This annoying habit, a nuisance when there were six, very cumbersome now that nine are involved, would have a paralysing effect on twelve. As you know, it was decided at the meeting of the European Council to which I have just referred, the one you attended in 1974, that the present practice should be changed. But it must be admitted that this intention has had very little effect up to now. The moment has come to act. Might it be suggested to the Council that, failing a sudden reversion to the normal application of the rules of the Treaties, a progressive system should be established and a list of decisions drawn up which henceforth should be taken normally, including, for example, all decisions concerning policies the principle of which has already been accepted. We hope that under your Presidency we shall at last see some real progress towards adherence to the rules of the Treaties, which, moreover, have never been changed and to which it is high time we reverted.

My second point is that, while there is only one Parliament and only one Commission, we find that there are in fact several Councils, each independent of the others, without there being sufficient authority for coordination. The rejection of the 1980 budget by our Parliament is a direct result of this. When we symbolically reduced spending on the common agricultural policy, and everyone now admits that this is necessary, the Ministers of Agriculture discussed the issue. Not only did they refuse to accept this reduction: they even increased expenditure. And then the Finance Ministers, legitimately concerned at the overall budgetary burden, pointed out that, as their agricultural colleagues had increased agricultural expenditure, they would have to reduce social and regional spending. Mr President, I would say that that is poor administration and therefore poor policy. It is unreasonable that ministers specializing in a given field, and no one is disputing the importance of this field, should alone decide their budgetary allocation without regard to the general requirements. It is time the Council adopted better methods of administering the policies and finances of the Community and realized that the Community must have a single Council bearing ultimate responsibility.

## Rey

And so I come to my third point, and I now address you as a Foreign Minister. This is undoubtedly the most difficult issue and the most difficult from your point of view. What I want to say is that it no longer seems normal to me these days that the Foreign Ministers should be looking after the international problems of the Community. The Community's external relations are undoubtedly continuing to grow in importance in Europe, in Africa, throughout the world. It is, of course, right and essential that their administration, where they concern the Council, should remain in the hands of our Foreign Ministers. But the situation is different, I feel, where the Community's internal policy is concerned: it is no longer an external matter for our governments. It has been in existence for a quarter of a century. It has become, I repeat, an internal matter. Our Community is no longer a subject of negotiation: it needs to be governed. This task should therefore be entrusted to the Economics Ministers. They are better equipped than others to perform this task. They do so within our Member States. They have the general authority that allows them to assess all the aspects of the policies concerned. That was how it was at the beginning of the Community, in the special Council of Ministers of the European Coal and Steel Community, of which I was a member for four years. It was the Economics Ministers who met in Luxembourg every month, and I would go so far as to say that it worked very well. I believe we must revert to this practice and that in future the Economics Ministers should be generally responsible for and supervise the Community's internal affairs.

Mr President, I do not expect you to respond to my suggestions immediately. If you consider them worthy of your attention, you will no doubt want to discuss them with your colleagues before perhaps stating your views. Tell them that they come from a man who has devoted more than a quarter of a century of his life to the Community. And as he speaks the last words he will be able to address to this Assembly, permit him to say to you, Madam President, that he has every confidence, despite all the present difficulties, in the future of our Community. I believe the time has come for it to adapt its institutions to the needs of its growing responsibility in Europe and throughout the world.

*(The Assembly rises to give the speaker a long ovation)*

**President.** — Mr Rey, you have just confirmed your intention of leaving our Parliament, which you had previously indicated to me by letter. I should like therefore to convey to you the gratitude of Parliament for the part you have played in its proceedings for many years now. We regret that we shall no longer hear you in this House, that we shall no longer meet you in the corridors and that we are losing a true friend.

*(Loud applause)*

I call Mrs Ewing.

**Mrs Ewing.** — Madam President, on behalf of my group may I welcome the President-in-Office to his very exalted and extremely responsible position. There can be few such responsible and worrying positions in the whole arena of world politics and I wish him well.

A year ago I was raising a number of hopes that I hoped would be answered in the life of this Parliament and perhaps I might be excused if I urge the President-in-Office to give favourable consideration to using some of his energy to getting some of these hopes translated. I am concerned that so many of the citizens in the Community are still largely ignorant of what we do and that this does not seem to be improving greatly. I do suggest that here is no real reason why we should be so secretive in our committee practice and I feel that we should start looking at the possibility of opening up our committees. I do not think we have such secret matters being discussed inside committees that we cannot simply say, these are open doors. I think that would help to disseminate more interest in and information about the Community right down to our citizenry.

The other matter which will not surprise you, Madam President, I am sure, is that I did hope that in the life of this Parliament we could remove all the inequalities that affect women — if it could not be done in six months, then at least I hoped the good work could be taken further. In my group there are five women out of twenty-two, which is quite a high proportion, and I feel we have made progress in setting up the women's committee. I wish them well. But I would like to make a practical suggestion for the next six months, a very simple one which has come from the Lord Advocate of Scotland — our chief law officer — namely, that the Member States should recognize each other's judgments, so that there would be no hiding-place for erring husbands or wives or parents or debtors. We would simply accept our judgments from our Supreme Courts as mutually recognizable. If we did this, I think we would take a tremendous step forward and a fairly simple one. It requires only the collective will of the Member States, and I think it would help to eliminate some of the injustices that do affect the female sex in the Community.

Could I also refer to my passionate desire that this Community should do what no Member State will do, that it should seek to impose a code of conduct on the behaviour of substandard oil tankers. In a recent debate initiated by myself I understand I got the support of every group in this Parliament on the need for this. I would urge the President-in-Office to get on with this job, because we have had a Bantry Bay disaster in Ireland, we have had a Brittany disaster in France, we have had a Shetland disaster in my area. The Channel is fraught with danger daily and so is the area in the North of Scotland. It is really a matter now

## Ewing

of getting on with doing this and of making much more stringent rules apply. The oil companies share the blame, but the Member States could control the oil companies' behaviour if we could get such a code. And with Greece's entry the urgency increases. I welcome Greece's entry on behalf of my group wholeheartedly — after all, Greece is a land of many islands and I represent 80 inhabited islands. I welcome the peripheries — Portugal and Spain — joining the Community; indeed I believe that the existence of this Community has a lot to do with the fact that these countries became democracies when we all trembled to think what might happen to them. So I welcome enlargement. But on the matter of oil tankers, let us not close our eyes to the fact that we are going to get the largest fleet in the world added to us — an accident-prone fleet with three times the accident rate of the rest of the world and an elderly fleet of which half the tankers are extremely old, many of them having been bought when, for instance, the United Kingdom sent them for scrap. I do not think the problem is going to go away because no-one talks about it very often. I think it really has to be looked at in the next six months or we are going to face a serious problem. Bear in mind that we have a scrap-and-build proposal from the Commission and it looks as if only Greece would really benefit and would use up the whole quota of what is really an excellent set of proposals.

No-one will be surprised if I mention that the common fisheries policy has not yet come into being. Now there is a great problem here. Uncertainty is not good for any Member State. Uncertainty is not good for any of the industries in the Member States. In fact, uncertainty is resulting in lack of investment. It is costing the lives of certain small communities and it is costing the livelihood of men at sea because of the uncertainty and the worry about paying their bank loans. I have pressed the Commission repeatedly to give the vital statistics about what fuel subsidies, what interest-rate subsidies are being given in the Member States. Without that information we can never have a common fisheries policy. So I would urge the President-in-Office to use his influence to see if we could not get the vital statistics, and then we will know in what direction we should proceed. I think we have to look at licencing as being an automatic right of owner-skipper. I think quotas should give some recognition to the countries with the largest fish ponds. And I think we should all remember that the whole Community has a responsibility to safeguard the fabric of lives in remote places where there are no alternatives.

May I also ask the President to sympathize with those of us who serve on the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning. I am one of the frustrated regionalists. I remember Mr Brandt's opening speech, in which he said that Europe was a Europe of the regions. Well, it is frustrating that we have no identifiable regional policy. The criteria for eligibility for aid change certainly, but very slowly. For instance, tour-

ism is now accepted. I have been urging the criteria of remoteness and lack of population. Perhaps that will come. Commissioner Burke has excellent proposals but no budget. But it is a frustrating thing to see the needs and to see that the funds are not always reaching the people. My colleague, Mr Flanagan, mentioned that in a speech in June, when he was talking about the millions that were returned to the general budget. Why on earth, when you think of all the good projects that could have been given aid and could have also served as a means of awakening the interest of all our citizenry? I have pleaded in this committee for flexibility, because to have a numerical rule about a number of jobs makes no sense in certain remote areas. I have pleaded about additionality. I would urge the President-in-Office to look favourably on the proposals of the transport infrastructure schemes. I think that is one very excellent field in which great assistance can be given. I welcome the fact that in this year the Commission has decided to have a code of conduct for multinational companies. I am only sad it has come too late to prevent a highland clearance in my area.

On the budget war, can I just say this, that I regret it — I think it was a phoney war. Now I hope we can get on with the budget, because in that delay many excellent projects have been held up. I think to some extent it was a new parliament flexing its muscles, and at the end of the day I wonder to what avail, seeing that we have capitulated. So I do hope that this kind of war among the institutions will not be continued.

I would just like to end by saying that I would beware of some of the kind of speeches we hear assuming that it is the view of all of us that Europe should be a quasi-military super-power. That is not the view of all the Member States and it is not the view of all the citizens. I think it is a dangerous thing to make speeches assuming that all the citizens want that or agree with it. I would like to congratulate this Parliament on what it has done in the human rights field. I believe its influence carries far beyond even its own citizens, when it speaks up on the issues of human rights. And I am very proud to be in the Lomé Convention, which is one of the greatest international achievements in the world. I can only hope that we will proceed to do good work in these fields.

*(Applause)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella to speak on a point of order.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, I would request that the stop-watch, the guillotine, not be set in motion, as I am rising on a point of order.

I wish to point out that the eleven Members in my group asked to be included in the list of speakers, but my name alone is to be found in this list. I should therefore like to see the names at least reinstated in the list since, although at present mouths can be gagged and voices silenced, we have not yet been deprived of our identity.

Since I feel, Mr President, that this Assembly has deprived us of the parliamentary rights which we have duty to exercise, I must tell you that we refuse to be party to this languid masquerade, which is an insult to a free Parliament. We do not intend to give our approval to these procedures by taking the floor as you dictate — or in reality remaining silent rather than taking the floor. You have allocated us five minutes to reply to the President of the Council — five minutes for eleven Members! It would be a travesty to reply to President Thorn by accepting the anti-parliamentarian rule which you are imposing on us and which make of our Parliament not a free Parliament but a disgrace when we consider our hopes and our electors.

This being the case, Mr President, I felt I must pay tribute to the President and present her with a gift to mark this anniversary. I shall present it to you instead: it is a gag. It is a symbol worthy of you.

I shall now take three seconds of the speaking time I have been allocated for the debate to say, simply. M. . .

*(Mr Pannella approaches the Chair with a placard and a gag.)*

**President.** — Mr Pannella wants to stage a demonstration! I hope that the photographers are present! We know how he works. Mr Pannella, for all your polite words, you have not raised a point of order, because the agenda was discussed yesterday and adopted. All the Members whose names you wished to have put on the list of speakers have been entered on it. We must not waste too much time playing the clown here, must we?

**Mr Pannella.** — (J) I should like to make you a present of this; it is a gag.

**President.** — In the Belgian Parliament, Mr Pannella, you would never get this far, but I shall graciously accept your present, because tomorrow is my birthday.

*(Laughter)*

All the members of Mr Pannella's group have been put on the list of speakers, but they have only ten minutes

between them. If each one wants to speak at the same length as Mr Pannella, it will obviously be impossible even for their fourth speaker to get the floor.

I call Mr De Goede.

**Mr De Goede.** — (NL) Mr President, as spokesman for the Dutch D'66 party I should like to say to Mr Thorn that as democrats we are very happy that Parliament should be able from time to time to place its Members on the government and Commission benches. After Mr Colombo, we now have another good example in Mr Thorn.

This morning our President reviewed the activities of the European Parliament in the last twelve months. She rightly made the important observation that this Parliament fulfils its legislative duties. To the Council I must unfortunately say it has hitherto taken too little account of the position, the opinions, the questions, the debates and the resolutions of this Parliament. The Council also pays too little attention to the initiatives taken by Parliament. I therefore find that Mr Colombo has done well and Mr Thorn would do well to bear Parliament's views in mind. After one year of the European Parliament it can be said, I think, that we have had a number of teething troubles, but that the child has grown a little. But that means the Council cannot go on treating Parliament as if it had remained a small child. From what I have heard from members of the Dutch Government and from other sources I know, and this is an indictment of the Council, I feel that the Council does not take sufficient account of the existence of a European Parliament which has been elected to represent 260 million Europeans.

The European Parliament's position also means that we have a say in the establishment of the budget that will be before us soon. None of us wants renewed confrontation with the Council and/or Commission over the 1981 budget, but confrontation is inevitable if last year's spectacle is repeated through the Council not taking sufficient account of Parliament.

What basically is the issue? Of course, we all know individually what we want. As the representative body of the European community of nations this Parliament wants influence. We do not want to abandon the agricultural policy; we want to reorganize it. And we must think more about other areas, energy, the environment, employment, than we have done in the past. If it is important for actual policy to be related to the citizens of Europe, then it is in the field of incomes, employment, energy supplies, agricultural prices and so on. I therefore hope that, when the 1981 budget is being drawn up, attention will be paid not only to agriculture, but also, and more so, to energy, the environment, employment, industrial innovation and convergence between the Member States.

**De Goede**

Mr Thorn talked about energy this morning and indicated the priorities in this connection. He attaches great importance to nuclear energy in the future energy policy. He must then surely ask himself whether he is reflecting fairly the views of the community of European nations and taking due account of its priorities. I personally think, Mr Thorn, that the first priority of the energy policy must be a good conservation programme and research into ways of conserving energy. Substantial savings are possible. Give this subject more thought!

Secondly, referring now to coal technology, we must not forget that we are trying to find a solution to the environmental problems in Europe. And we must not create a new environmental problem by changing from oil-fired to coal-fired power stations on a massive scale. In the field of research the Community in particular has a duty to ensure that no new environmental problems emerge and that we therefore take the necessary action to protect the environment when changing from oil-fired to coal-fired power stations. Furthermore, when the newly formed Commission — including Mr Thorn — appears before us in January, it must submit to Parliament a multiannual programme which gives concrete form to the policy lines I have mentioned in the fields of energy, employment, the environment and so on.

Nor may we close our eyes to the problem we shall very soon have to face when we exceed the 1 % limit for the financing of the Community's own resources. The time required to achieve this 1 % increase will inevitably be longer than the few months we have left. Mr Thorn and the Dutch Presidency must realize that it is really too late to escape this confrontation, i.e. a budgetary deficit in 1981, not to speak of the 1982 budget. Consequently, it is also too late now to follow up Parliament's request that consideration should be given to areas of Community policy of immediate interest to the citizens of Europe. I hope that Mr Thorn and the new Commission will not delay in examining the views expressed by Parliament, the resolutions it adopts and the initiatives it takes, because otherwise it must face the electorate empty-handed at the next elections in four year's time. The Council must strengthen Parliament's position, and this also applies to the new Commission which begins its activities in January 1981.

**President.** — I call Mr Kirk.

**Mr Kirk.** — (DK) Mr President, I was most interested to hear the President-in-Office of the Council's speech this morning. Parliament's wish, as expressed in Mr Rey's report a few months ago, to hear a statement by the President of the Commission before he takes office, has now been met, albeit probably unintentionally. It is probably due more to chance that we have heard Mr Thorn today as President of the Council,

and will probably be hearing him in six months time as President of the Commission. But it has heightened the interest of his exposition of the Council's work over the next half year. I should like to concentrate on the question of internal solidarity in the Community and on foreign policy.

As somebody said at our last part-session during the debate on the report by the outgoing Council President, Mr Colombo, on the past six months work, it is a fact of political life that when you solve one set of problems, a new set immediately takes its place. That is the situation today, as Mr Thorn described it in his speech. I should like to draw your attention to what I see as the great threat to the further development of the Community. If there is general acceptance of the concept of limited solidarity between the Member States that emerged during the dispute over the budget this year, and persisted even after a solution had been found, I think we are facing a substantial threat to European cooperation. If the Community's financial basis is altered, developments in European cooperation will be slowed down if not completely halted. Not many people can want that, and those that do are the people who want to see the Community fall. I cannot lay too much stress on my warning. As I said, I am thinking of the statements that the Community should be limited, or that there should be limits to how much the individual Member States should put into the Community and how much they can get out of it.

I should like to ask — and I hope I shall also get an answer — whether we can really talk about a Community if that principle is incorporated in the Community's financial arrangements. Would we not then be talking about a kind of collaboration between a group of rich countries looking for solutions to a limited number of specific problems? Would the Treaty of Rome have been drawn up and signed at all if this principle had been current in 1957 and had been uppermost in the minds of those who led the way to European cooperation?

We must acknowledge that among the Member States few take a really European attitude towards the future development of the Community. We must also acknowledge that selfish national interests and attitudes towards European cooperation are coming to the fore. The other day I saw a survey of public attitudes within the Community towards European cooperation, and it was very clear that there was little enthusiasm for it, but a recognition that it was necessary. I should like to warn against the tendency in some Member States to pander to the popular view of the Community rather than tell the public what is required for the development of the European Community.

In your speech, Mr Thorn, you dealt briefly with European monetary cooperation. But you did not explain what future developments should take place in the monetary system nor did you touch on the chances

**Kirk**

of all Member States joining in that cooperation. Many of those present today will realise that a lot of the problems we are encountering in different fields are simply due to the widely differing economic and monetary situations in the Member States. I should therefore like to know whether greater priority might not be given to monetary cooperation within the Community.

Finally, I feel you did not say a great deal about the state of tension between the West and the Soviet Union. I should very much like to hear your assessment of future relations between the Community and the Soviet Union, particularly in the light of Helmut Schmidt's recent meeting with Mr Brezhnev. Are we going to see an easing of the tension, and a renewal of the policy of détente, and is there any chance of persuading the Soviet Union to work more seriously for peace, or would you say that no new developments were likely to follow this meeting?

In conclusion, Mr Thorn, I would agree with your remarks on Afghanistan. It must be made absolutely clear that we in the West and we in Europe cannot be happy about events in Afghanistan until there has been a complete withdrawal of Soviet troops.

**President.** — I call Mr Piquet.

**Mr Piquet.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, what is peculiar about politics is that it leads each one of us either to repeat himself or to contradict himself. The President-in-Office of the Council is no exception to this rule. As he does not intend to change the broad lines adopted by his predecessors, he can only repeat himself. I find this rather regrettable, because something might otherwise have happened in this Assembly. Let me illustrate this statement with a few observations.

Firstly, although the President of the Council speaks of the various economic and social aspects that characterize the situation in the Community, I also heard him refer in his statement to structural modifications, to inflation. I heard him refer to investments, growth and other very real economic concepts, but I did not hear him mention — perhaps my hearing is deficient — unemployment. I did not hear him once say the words 'male and female workers'. But this is a basic and well-known economic fact. It is work that creates wealth, work is the source of wealth. Behind the economic structures, growth, inflation and all these other economic concepts are millions and millions of men and women whose presence, standard of living, living conditions are determining factors in the development of our societies. But evidently the Council is not concerned with such things, and one thing explains another.

Secondly, the President of the Council refers to the important question of energy, and here again, as

always, oil raises its ugly head. But, as we know, the economists refuse to attribute all the present grave economic and monetary difficulties to the one factor, oil.

I was glad to hear the President of the Council referring in his statement to the question of coal. But at the same time I protest against the import of coal at a time when mines are being closed in France, when we have considerable national resources. Even worse, the French tax-payer is contributing towards the Community subsidies granted for German coal, where the trend in production is known. It is not surprising, then, that in my country this Community policy is opposed by the miners, the farmers and the workers and that this opposition also extends to the enlargement of the Community.

Thirdly, the President of the Council refers to the enlargement of the Community and asks us not to overdramatize the difficulties that have been encountered. In my opinion, it is not the difficulties during the negotiations that are dramatic, it is the consequences which enlargement will have for industry and agriculture, for the workers in my country. I also noticed that Mr Thorn kept quiet about how the tax-payer is going to have to pay for the financial present that has been made to Britain. It came to 4,000 m francs in the case of my country, and how much is the enlargement of the European community going to cost us tomorrow? In these circumstances, it is therefore understandable that the plans for enlargement are meeting with increasing opposition. Personally, as you know, not only am I opposed to enlargement but also, and categorically, I am in favour of all preparatory negotiations being brought to a halt.

Fourthly and lastly, the President of the Council hopes that Europe will play a more active and more independent political role in the international arena. But it would be no exaggeration, I believe, to say that Mr Carter plays a major part in the Council's decisions. He is even becoming increasingly 'European', if I am to believe what I have heard in the last few days about the outcome of the Venice summit conference, or even the threatening demands he addresses to this or that Community Head of State.

I will conclude by asserting that Mr Thorn's Presidency — and I hope Mr Thorn will excuse me, I do not mean him personally — is clearly resolved to continue a policy of which it cannot be said that it is marked by success, but which is more than ever characterized by the decisions taken in Venice by the major Western powers under American leadership. Everyone will understand that this policy does not meet with our approval.



**President.** — I call Mrs Dienesch.

**Mrs Dienesch.** — (*F*) Mr Thorn, you may rest assured that my Group views with a great deal of pleasure your return to the top level of European activity. Your talents as a negotiator are much needed at this time of great uncertainty about the continuation of the activities begun more than twenty years ago, and at what everyone considers to be a major turning point, despite the work of our Assembly and its many meetings, sometimes too many meetings.

I should like to begin by saying that it seems to me you have an important role to play in strengthening the internal cohesion of the Community. At some séances the cry goes out: 'Spirit, are you there?' The question that should be put to the Nine is: 'European spirit, are you there?' We would be very grateful to you if you could manage to ensure that in this Council everyone pulls in the same direction.

During your statement, we were very pleased — my Group and myself — to hear you stress the role of the Council of Ministers in all deliberations and decisions, as compared with the Assembly, which in no way minimizes the role of our Assembly, but is in line with the Treaties, which we must respect. You also emphasized, I am happy to say, that it is not for the Assembly to establish policies through the budget, but merely to express its opinion on them. Those two remarks seem to make good sense. Thank you for making them.

As regards the functioning of our Assembly, there is clearly a lack of cooperation among the institutions. Encroaching on the others' powers sometimes seems to be the aim of each institution, and we for our part feel it would perhaps be better to reconsider the report of the 'Three Wise Men' to improve coordination and do away with this perpetual guerilla warfare to gain excessive power.

Within the Council too, you must ensure that the governments demonstrate at least a glimmer of European thinking, in other words that they do not make excessive demands in some cases and do without in others, and perhaps also ensure that public statements, whoever they are made by, take slightly more account of the European position. For example, we worried the public with the statements on Portugal and Spain, and I am pleased to say that the EPD Group has stressed the need for more frequent meetings with these two countries, while setting a later date for the time when they can be welcomed as Member States of the Community. But we do not think it is very reasonable to say 'yes' one day and 'no' the next. I feel the Community has its role to play in this, its European role.

Secondly, the European Council must not replace the Council of Ministers, which performs a legislative task on the basis of the Commission's proposals, providing,

of course, that such proposals exist. Too often the Council is confronted with communications and memoranda and not often enough with carefully drawn up proposals for regulations or directives. But the Council needs these to set the priorities for Community action in the years to come. These should be set before the end of 1981. This master plan must indicate 'the direction of action to be taken and the means'. Is this being drawn up? The Community lacks medium-term prospects, and pious hopes or worldly daydreams during certain summit meetings cannot replace the will and the ability of the Nine to plan their action for the years to come.

What part did the European Council play? It undoubtedly came to an agreement — as you have said. But after that, did we not find deliveries being made to the USSR and Britain refusing to implement the decision on Iran? And what was the position on the Olympic Games? The public has the impression that there is less European sentiments than diplomatic hypocrisy in all this.

Some Members might fear the power of a supranational Europe. Their report after a year of experience shows that we might have a greater fear of the confederation of clans, teams, committees and electoral needs than of the political authority which should provide overall coordination. Only if this coordination is achieved can you count on the wholehearted support of this Assembly.

I shall say no more than a few words about two other aspects, since I cannot, in so short a statement, take up all the very many points which you raised. You painted a general picture of all the difficulties we face, and we obviously agree with you. To all the issues you raised we must find appropriate solutions, and perhaps your statement contained, of necessity, rather too many opinions of a general nature, which no one would dispute, rather too much vagueness where dispute there might have been, and here I am referring in particular to the Middle East.

I have to make more remarks, one on employment, the other on the North-South Dialogue. As regards employment, yes, we must, as the speaker before me said, realize that this is not only an economic problem. It is a question of the attitude of young people towards the future. Although Europe has a fund of values, although it makes it know that it has them, its youth must not grow up with a feeling of uselessness, of a lack of solidarity. The youth must also have an opportunity to get to know these values and to understand them through action and not to find themselves excluded from the everyday life of their country. This is an aspect to which I should like to draw your attention.

As regards the North-South Dialogue, we sometimes wonder whether, since the negotiations began, the slightest progress has been made. Of course, there

## Dienesch

have been steps forward: the joint raw materials stabilization fund, which recently came into being after four years of discussion and which will enter into force when 90 Member States, accounting for two-thirds of direct contributions, have joined it. There is a danger that such progress will long remain theoretical, since the functioning of the joint fund depends on agreements on raw materials. But agreement has been reached on only one of 20 products, rubber. I will not dwell on this. Meetings will also be held on all the other products under the aegis of UNCTAD. In these circumstances, I doubt that the special session of the United Nations General Assembly will be very successful.

Finally, we are witnessing decisions and episodic meetings, and I am afraid that this multiplicity of fora, in which everyone has the last word to say on the subject, will wind up simply complicating matters. I would ask you to ensure that there is far more precision in the objectives pursued and far more haste in their achievement. You have said that you will give a new impulse to cooperation with the developing countries. But do you have the means to do so at the moment, and are we not sometimes adopting the wrong course by focusing primarily on an economic model proposed by the industrialized countries?

For them, it is a philosophy of making good and of interdependence, but this very often clashes with the attitudes and basic concepts of the Third World. It clashes with the sense of its collective autonomy. Perhaps, as I previously said, the economic viewpoint should be supported by a closer examination of the problems, with respect shown for men, with understanding for cultures, with greater respect for the specific values of the North and South, without which all our efforts will not only continue for a long time, but may perhaps one day prove to have been utterly useless.

**President.** — I call Mr Ryan.

**Mr Ryan.** — Mr President, as I will not have the opportunity of speaking tomorrow, may I use this occasion to extend to you my personal best wishes and those of all the Members of the House on your birthday. You are so eternally young, it is hard to believe you will be a day and a year older tomorrow.

Mr President, if the European Economic Community is to hold the interest and support of the citizens of Europe, it will need to replace the battle of words and figures over the budget with realistic action in the economic field. Our citizens are disenchanted with the argument over the bookkeeping of the Community budget. A budget that amounts to a fraction of 1 % of Europe's gross domestic product cannot provide remedies for Europe's great problems. It is high time, there-

fore, that we lifted our heads out of the account books and worked out and applied new dynamic economic policies.

Community action during the 1974-76 world recession was not wonderful, but its thrust was at least positive. For instance, the Commission recycled OPEC surpluses towards Member States in difficulties and the Social Fund was boosted to assist in maintaining jobs. The Council, even if internally anxious — and as a Member of the Council at the time I know it was — none the less spoke publicly with an encouraging, confident voice against pessimism. But now, when our economies are sliding into deeper and deeper recession, there is a real danger that Europe will tumble into depression. We are unfortunately led by a Council of Ministers or by governments paralysed by their own pessimism and divisions, and Europe is consequently in danger of tumbling into a depression. I would say, let us have a little cheer instead, and I would like to thank the President-in-Office, Mr Thorn, for his encouraging words and for his obvious dedication to the task of finding European solutions to our problems.

It is, of course, right to wage war on inflation; but combating inflation must not be allowed to take priority over the prevention or reduction of unemployment. They are inseparable parts of economic wisdom, but to beat inflation it is not necessary to suffer unemployment rates of 5% to 40% in the worst regions. The human misery and frustration associated with high unemployment leads to irresistible calls for greater and greater unproductive public expenditure. More grievous than the inflation resulting from oil price rises in the last 7 years are the waves of inflation triggered by public spending which repeatedly wash over Europe's economy. Unemployment is unfortunately widespread throughout Europe, bankruptcies are increasing, so are business failures, but its worse levels are in the most disadvantaged areas which are least able to fight unemployment. Therefore the need for EEC policies on an EEC level is obvious.

There are several areas where action can be taken without any addition to the European budget. For instance, more immediate and far-reaching action is required to protect Europe's textile and carpet industries from unfair competition. It is deplorable that steps have not been taken to exclude US products which are manufactured with heavily subsidized oil. When car sales in Europe are falling off because of recession, it is unacceptable that imports of Japanese cars should be on the increase. Other areas where Community funds should be positively spent and restructuring policies imaginatively applied are in the steel, metal manufacturing and shipbuilding industries and in industries based on timber. European energy resources also need a Community policy. There is something fundamentally wrong with the argument, which was put forward again in this House today, that progress cannot be made on the industrial front

Ryan

because the common agricultural policy runs away with 75 % of the Community budget. It is mad to demand the dismantling of Europe's one really successful economic policy as a precondition for taking remedial action in the industrial and energy sectors. When Europe can be self-sufficient in food, it is wrong that Europe should import food from other markets while the poorest countries suffer 30 % shortages of essential foodstuffs. When Europe has failed millions of industrial workers, it would be a further act of insanity to drive more families out of agriculture to join their industrial colleagues in the queues of the unemployed. Respect for the dignity of man and man's labour, the risk to democracy resulting from social unrest sparked by unemployment, the underuse of productive capacity during a recession, all point to the crucial importance of stimulating Europe's economy now rather than later.

I share all my colleagues' concern about the problems and injustices in many other parts of the world. I agree that Europe has a duty to make her own contribution to the easing of world tensions. I feel, however, that too much energy and time is wasted in this Parliament, in the Council and in the Commission tilting at other people's windmills, driven by winds outside our control, telling the rest of the world how to run their affairs while we shy away from solving Europe's problems like energy shortages, the unemployment of the young, industrial collapse or conflicts in Northern Ireland.

I am flattered that Mr Rey anticipated my final comment. Like him, I believe it does not help Europe to take the right direction on internal economic problems when foreign ministers are given the driving wheel. The nature of their jobs requires them to preserve national sovereignties as sacrosanct, to talk in generalities and to avoid specifics. Europe's greatest need is to break the old inefficient moulds and to replace them with realistic Community policies. We can hardly expect the Council of Foreign Ministers to pass a vote of no confidence in themselves — and I am not asking them to do so — but I would like to see the governments of Europe give prior responsibility for European affairs to ministers who are not preoccupied with questions of national prestige to the exclusion of specific economic objectives.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Curry.

**Mr Curry.** — Mr President-in-Office, your country comes to the presidency at a time of greater flux and uncertainty than perhaps any other in the Community's history. The old order, whether it be in agriculture or budgets or social organization, seems everywhere to be fragmenting, and the main job of your presidency is to lay down the first guidelines as to how

this Community can start to emerge from the uncertainty which lies within it and all around it.

I wish to speak specifically about the agricultural policy, Mr President. Your first great task as President-in-Office must be to begin the work of reforming the agricultural policy. I do not use that expression lightly; we know it will take a long time. We know that, with elections in two large Member States coming up, the final solutions will take certainly months and maybe years to decide, but it is the job of the presidency to start immediately to define what the options are in reforming the agricultural policy. The alternative to that is to have nine national bureaucracies beavering away in nine national capitals. They will emerge with nine separate proposals for reform, all of them carefully tailored to national interests, and the idea of rescuing and promoting what is the only genuine Community policy, whether it be good or bad, will have fallen by the wayside. Your first task must be to lay down the tape and define the terms upon which this debate proceeds.

Your second task, Mr President-in-Office, must be, at last, to get the Council and the Commission to tackle the very real problems consequent upon enlargement, particularly where it concerns Mediterranean foodstuffs. When we are talking about these products, we are not simply talking about financial threat. We are talking also about a political threat, about a threat to law and order and social peace. Anybody who has witnessed the events on the Franco-Spanish frontier over recent months will realize just how volatile and emotional this sector is. We know what the products are — olive oil, wine, fruit and vegetables — which threaten to go out of control, not just after enlargement but before, and which are already absorbing an increasing slice of the Community budget. It is no good taking political decisions about the desirability of enlargement if we are not prepared to look in the face the economic, financial and social consequences of those political decisions. Mr President, if you can help the social consequences to catch up with some of the political decision-making, you will be doing a very important job for this Community.

Finally, Mr President, you must tackle on a global scale the problem of agricultural structures in this Community. Up to now we have had a feeble little policy which has got nowhere. Yet the exodus of people from the land will continue and is continuing even despite the recession. When the economy does recover, it will accelerate. At the same time we have a rapidly ageing agricultural workforce, a fact which will also tend to depopulate our countryside. It is no good trying to respond to that challenge by little bits of actions here and there on the west coast of Ireland or in the south of Italy. We need a genuine global approach which brings to bear all the Community's instruments in order to tackle the genuine social problems caused by the devastation of our regions and our provinces. When you are doing this, Mr President,

## Curry

you should recognize that for certain members of the Community, indeed for all of them, those social and regional problems have an industrial character as well as an agricultural character. The more we can start to bring together the various categories of people threatened under the umbrella of a genuine policy, the greater service we will be doing.

Now, Mr President, there are also certain specific problems in agriculture to which I think you should direct your attention. There is the problem of beef. At the moment practically every tonne of beef slaughtered in France and Ireland is going straight into intervention. It is curious that this system, in which we are 96 % self-sufficient in beef and import the remainder to create a balance in the market, should still cost 500 million pounds a year to manage. There is certainly something wrong with the way that system is organized when something like this can come about. We would like you to direct your attention to that.

You must also as a matter of priority tie up the remaining part of the sheepmeat policy. It is virtually incomprehensible, and if you can understand it, Mr President, you will have no doubt demonstrated your worthiness to assume the office which you now hold. Certainly the negotiations with New Zealand must be concluded rapidly, and, of course, the subsequent negotiations with New Zealand also to secure a just and equitable access for its dairy produce after the end of this year.

In the dairy sector, Mr President, we would all dearly love to know, what the idea of a super levy — another 1½ % or whatever on the co-responsibility levy — really means. We know that the Council has pledged itself to implement this super levy. We do not believe you. We wish we could believe you. We wish we could place more credence on what is said, but we know that promises have a way of evaporating once the magic word 'modality' is mentioned. There are going to be a lot of modalities accompanying your promises in this sector. Mr President, when you do sort out your modalities, we should very much like to see such a super levy applied on a regional basis to those people increasing their milk production not in the form of a flat-rate increase on the already unjust co-responsibility levy designed specifically to penalize those who produce milk most efficiently.

Finally, Mr President, there is the fishing problem. That is a very thorny question, but one which I believe is not incapable of solution. There seem to be several guidelines which can be followed. The Norwegian poutbox, for example, has caused a lot of difficulty in the Community, but provided we can arrive at a proper process of policing and inspection and control, there is no reason why these fish cannot be caught without disturbing the breeding grounds of other species. In the whole of the Community's fishing policy the question of licensing and control must be

carried out on a Community basis. There is also the crucial issue of access to fish and the share of the catch in that vital area which lies between 12 miles and 50 miles off the United Kingdom coast. We believe that if we can tackle that, beginning perhaps by looking at it on a regional basis and adopting the criteria of traditional catches, we can then develop it into a Community policy which we can all of us defend.

These are specific questions, and I have tried to put specific issues to you, Mr President. There is an immense uncertainty in the Community, particularly in the agricultural sector. It haunts not just the farmers but all who live off the land and from the land, whether it be manufacturers of agricultural equipment or processors of raspberry jam in Scotland. These people have got the right to have some certainty in their lives, because at the moment all the certitude with which they have been brought up is disappearing. It is up to you, Mr President, to lay down the first guidelines that will ensure that we emerge from these uncertainties in a rational and intelligent manner and above all in a Community manner.

**President.** — I call Mr Coppieters.

**Mr Coppieters.** — (NL) Mr President, I shall begin with a quotation from the chairman of the Group of the European People's Party, Mr Klepsch: 'The first direct elections are an important step on the way to the political unification of a democratic Europe of free and independent citizens'. I have picked this quotation of set purpose, because today's agenda with the statement from the President-in-Office of the Council on the one hand and the Luster report on the other make it quite clear that this claim was too optimistic, not to say downright exaggerated. I should like to dwell a moment on the relations between the Council and Parliament. I feel that it can be argued that despite our most valiant and steadfast efforts no progress whatever has been made in regard to our position *vis-à-vis* the Council. This is quite clear in many sectors, including the energy sector.

I must also remark that we have so say whatever in regard to the major issues. Take the debate on unemployment, for instance; we have got absolutely nowhere on this. Finding jobs for people must be our first priority at this time, and I would hope that together with the Council we can finally work out a policy.

In conclusion I should like to say how unpalatable I find highflown speeches such as that made by Mr Lecanuet. Even in the Community itself some values that he mentioned, such as human rights, for instance, are not respected, and we have no right therefore to take the rest of the world to task.

**President.** — I call Mr Almirante.

**Mr Almirante.** — (*I*) Mr President of the Council, you opened your speech with a most apt reference to the Europe of the electors. It would be fitting for us all to remember, and above all for the Council of Ministers to remember, that the real European mandate lies with the electors who not only pass judgment on the Members of the European Parliament but also on the ministers and governments. Bearing in mind this Europe of the electors, I wish to comment, Mr President, on the problems of relations between Parliament and the Council, while Mr Romualdi — also speaking on behalf of the Italian right — will discuss the major political problems to which you referred.

You said — or at least this appears from the written text which was distributed to us, because I did not hear you say these words — that participation of Parliament in the life of the Community necessarily involves a legislative function. I agree: a good government presupposes a good parliament, and a good parliament cannot exist without a legislative function. I hope that the Council of Ministers will agree with this view — it has not done so in the past. You referred to the responsibility of the European Community in the area of the two major problems raised at the Venice summit: inflation and energy policy. Both these topics are of course vital, even more so than that of North-South relations, if only because a Europe with a high rate of inflation and heavy dependence on the oil producers would certainly not be able to meet its commitments to the developing countries. Let us learn how to live first — as the classical sages said, but their words would still be relevant in Europe today — before philosophizing over generous but hypothetical policies.

You referred to the procedure for the 1981 budget. But, Mr President, the real issue is this: does the Council intend once again to adopt a budget of stringency consisting essentially of compulsory expenditure, or will it adopt instead a genuine budget with a social content which can lead to real progress? In conclusion, you yourself deplored the erosion of Parliament's budgetary powers which are being reduced to a purely distributive function without the right to take new initiatives; you stated in all frankness that the consequence of this attitude is the stagnation of the Community process, deprived of the means of extending beyond the limits imposed by the unanimity rule.

Mr President, the Council must at long last come to see the budgetary problems in the more general context of the Community's social and economic development; I hope that you will succeed, so that Europe will move on from a struggle for its own survival to genuine construction — to a real Europe, a Europe of the people and of the electors.

**President.** — I call Mr Narducci.

**Mr Narducci.** — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mr Thorn's reference to the subject of development and cooperation, within the limits of a budget which I am afraid will once again be narrow and shortsighted in 1981, reminded us of one of the principal reasons for our presence in this Parliament.

If we believe that the Community must be more than a mere free trade area, if we believe that our responsibilities increase in direct proportion to the growth of international tension and if we consider that the cause of peace is inseparable from the fight against underdevelopment and misery, we must know full well that without an effective renewal of our policy of cooperation with the countries of the Third and Fourth World, and not mere lip-service to that policy, there is no point in speaking of the North-South Dialogue and we can only do further serious damage to the prospects of international détente which are already gravely jeopardized.

What kind of cooperation do we have in mind? Mr Thorn referred to the Second Convention of Lomé and to the need for it to be ratified at the earliest possible opportunity by the national Parliaments; he stressed the importance of the forthcoming UN General Assembly at the start of the third development decade and the role which the Community can and must play in the troubled Middle East, on the continent of Asia and in Latin America.

All this will certainly meet with our agreement and point to continuity in Community policy. However, we feel bound to call for an additional commitment, a greater effort. Such an effort is necessitated not merely by our recent budgetary problems, which have done unnecessary harm to our development policy and to the prospects of aid to the Third World, but also by the observation that the vast regions which require our attention are obliged to accept aid that is not disinterested, to suffer new and more perverse forms of colonialism and engage in a costly armaments policy which is always scandalous but has now become little short of suicidal. The reports coming out of Africa every day are extremely significant in this respect, but there are plenty of other examples too.

I do not think that we need seek many new paths to strengthen our action; it would suffice to continue on those already taken, because a disconcerting lack of courage has so far been apparent. Many examples serve to confirm this — the development aid target of 0.7 % remains a mirage while many developing countries experience difficulty in gaining access to new markets, despite Lomé II; the non-governmental organizations receive miserable amounts of aid; migrant workers from the Third World countries are only too often the subject of great discrimination in the Community; the difficult but bold proposal, which

**Narducci**

is only paradoxical at first sight, to finance development through a tax on armaments production and exports has not got off the ground.

Are these Utopian objectives? They might seem to be so, but if the Council, following the guidance given by Parliament, were to play its true role at the August session of the United Nations and if the Council were to provide an appropriate structure for the new Commission taking due account of the work done up to now, and if too the Council were to approach with real Community logic in the next half year and in the more distant future our relations with the developing countries and also to give real content to the North-South Dialogue, the objectives which today appear remote could still be achieved — even if with some difficulty. If we genuinely believe in international solidarity, we must follow this line of action through conviction; and even if we think first of our own national interests we must still recognize that we need the Third World and that there can be no salvation in isolation. This more than any other is the area in which the fortunes of the Community and of world peace will be determined. The Group of the European People's Party is aware of this, just as it recognizes the fact that the struggle for civil rights and independence can only be credible and obtain a general consensus if it is conducted where the need really arises — in Africa, South Africa and in the Middle East.

And then there is our own third world within the Community consisting of the millions of unemployed and the ever-increasing ranks of the young seeking their first job. Mr Thorn mentioned the crisis in the steel and textile industries; tomorrow, I believe, a motion for a resolution will be tabled by the EPP Group on the crisis in the motor vehicle industry which is not a matter of concern to Italy alone. As Mr Thorn pointed out, the fight against unemployment is first and foremost a matter for the national governments, but it is equally true that the Community as such can direct, through provision made in the new budget, new policies capable of meeting social requirements — ranging from transport to health — and capable of providing real aid in the struggle against unemployment which concerns each one of us.

As you have seen, we always come back to the budget: to a problem of political resolve in which Parliament — as the Council must recognize — has a right to intervene decisively over and above its consultative function.

*(Applause from the centre benches)*

**President.** — I call Lord O'Hagan.

**Lord O'Hagan.** — Mr President-in-Office and Mr President-to-be of the Commission, I wish to speak about one subject alone in the few moments allocated

to me and in so doing to address you in both your capacities, because it is often said that when somebody working in the European Community is in doubt about what to say or to do or both, he begins to discuss the institutions of the Community, or setting up a committee, or working out some way of examining the problems. But I think you, Sir, have a special role in getting some of these previous reports out of the library, retrieving some of their ideas and taking some firm action. We know the difficulties of enlargement. We know the way that the Council of Ministers has evolved its procedures with multifarious councils meeting, with different Ministers at different times taking conflicting decisions. We have the European Council and we have the Commission, which has become far too much of an international drafting agency, far too much of a technocratic paradise. We have the European Parliament which, although now legitimate, directly elected and politically conscious, has not yet discovered for itself a purpose within the balance of forces of the Community's institutions. Now you, Mr Thorn, have the task over the next few years of getting hold of the Community's institutions and injecting some new dynamism in them, because although the institutions themselves can never replace by their own activity political will or a sense of political purpose which must come, of course, from governments and from leaders in the Commission and this Parliament, the Community, although well past the age of adulthood, is still using institutions framed and developed early in its infancy. I hope that, under the presidency of Mr Thorn, we will begin to look more closely and more deeply at the real institutional problems of the Community, because unless we improve the institutions we will not get anywhere.

Why can we not have joint recruitment between this Parliament and the Commission? Why can we not get rid of the Economic and Social Committee, which wastes a lot of time and money? Why can we not re-examine the way the Council of Ministers works in order to bring to it some element of public participation without forfeiting any of the necessary diplomatic secrecy, because until the processes of governing the Community are made more accessible and more comprehensible to the people of the Community, none of the political initiatives will work. Therefore I hope that, when dreaming about the vistas of an energy policy or travelling around the world discussing and thinking about political cooperation, President Thorn will also tether himself firmly to the ground when thinking about the institutions, because unless he can drive them forward, it may be that we will have a Community of wonderful dreams but will be unable to translate them into firm and effective action. And, Mr President, I promise that in my humble capacity I will try to induce this Parliament to be more realistic, to waste less of its money, to restrict staff to what is basically necessary. Moreover, we in Parliament, through the committee on Budgets in particular, must discipline ourselves as well. But unless the President-in-Office drives the Community forward in this way,

**Lord O'Hagan**

none of the necessary reforms will in fact be achieved. Thank you, Mr President. Happy Birthday! I hope, President Thorn, you have a good lunch here and come to see us often. *(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Romualdi.

**Mr Romualdi.** — *(I)* Mr President, in his speech Mr Thorn drew clear and specific attention to the great prospects and difficulties ahead of the Community. The prospects can be summed up as our increasingly practical possibility of playing a role in the world as an independent Community in every sector and of making our contribution to the solution of the vital problems of policies today.

The difficulties on the other hand reside in the serious political and economic crisis — to which Mr Almirante referred — facing Europe and the Western world today, because they are increasingly exposed to the Communist challenge and to the demonstrable impossibility of making our voices heard individually instead of as a real community, we must act as a Community and not merely as nine countries joined together on certain economic and market issues, allied but free to act as we think best to safeguard our respective national interests.

Mr Berlinguer pointed out that Mr Thorn had failed to mention the Moscow meeting between Schmidt and Brezhnev in the context of a policy of dialogue and encounters — including the Madrid conference — which, come what may, must never be interrupted, regardless of the attempts by Russia and international Communism to destabilize the existing balance and the policy of peace and security, attempts which have in effect been under way practically every day for the past 35 years.

But what could Mr Thorn have said that we have not already read in the newspapers? What does the Community know about the real issues which were discussed in Moscow? France and the White House administration have certainly been informed and perhaps other countries have also been informed individually, but the Community as such knows nothing. This is the regrettable fact and this is what makes a European initiative impossible, because action must not be taken by individual countries, by Schmidt or Giscard, but by the entire Community without exception.

What joint action will now be taken on the basis of the joint declaration issued in Venice on the Middle East with a view to moving towards practical solutions? This Parliament and the Commission and Council proposed some time ago economic sanctions against Russia following the occupation of Afghanistan and against Iran following the taking of hostages. What came of all this? Each country did as it pleased and

our debates went unheeded. Mr Glinne spoke of important steps taken in Tehran by three well-known Socialists, his friends Kreisky, Olof Palme and Gonzales. What result did they achieve other than the admittedly important achievement of not being taken hostage themselves?

Such is the reality. A reality in face of which individual actions, however determined and however inspired by good will, can have no chance of success. We need genuine Community action. The facts of the situation require this as do above all — and we have already been reminded of this at the end of our first year of activity in the directly elected Parliament — the peoples of Europe who have sent us here not simply to find solutions to a number of economic problems, which are still far from being solved, but to organize, in a context of genuine political cooperation, common action to respond to the economic and political challenges which must inevitably be faced on our path towards unification.

**President.** — I call Mr Alber.

**Mr Alber.** — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, one of the most tragic and shameful chapters of our times is the refugee problem. It is therefore gratifying to note that the Heads of State or Government did at least broach the subject of the tragedy and this suffering at the summit conference in Venice.

The United Nations estimated that there have been more than 12.8 m refugees since 1975. And everyone knows it is impossible to give an accurate figure. Experts calculate that about the same number of unknown refugees must be added to this figure. Many cannot be included in the records because they were murdered or died on the way to safety, drowned like so many of the 'boat people', or died of hunger or thirst like so many in Africa.

Nor does this figure include those who, despite the right of freedom of movement guaranteed by the UN Human Rights Convention, cannot leave their countries because they are locked up in prisons, work camps or so-called psychiatric wards.

This is principally the case in countries whose political system is much admired by some people in this House. What is striking is that 90 % of the refugees come from Marxist countries or have been expelled by so-called liberation organizations that are Marxist-oriented. More than a million have fled from Ethiopia, about a million from Vietnam, Laos and Kampuchea. More than one million have fled from Afghanistan, and this figure is rising by the day. Over half a million have been expelled from Angola. Every tenth Cuban no longer lives in his home country. One in four natives of Equatorial Guinea now lives outside that country.

**Alber**

Let there be no mistake: we accuse all countries that expel people, regardless of their political system. Thousands of refugees from Latin America are just as great a disgrace as thousands from Pakistan, South Africa or the Philippines. It applies to the expulsion of the Palestinians and to the fact that they are deliberately left in misery and misused for political purposes. And 80 000 refugees from Chile are also 80 000 too many. Strange to say, most of these refugees have fled to so-called capitalist countries. Only 1 500 have gone over to the German Democratic Republic and 1 000 to Romania. In the UN High Commission's list of host countries the name of the Soviet Union will be sought in vain. This also surely provides food for thought!

But all these figures tell us nothing of the endless suffering. What suffering and hardship normally form part of the fate of refugees! Many continue to be pursued by agents in the countries to which they have fled. Sanctuaries and asylums were obviously only to be found in ancient times. Today there are no churches, no Temple of Athena in Tegea, no Temple of Poseidon in Calauria. We are, of course, living in modern times. Many refugees receive no more than scant assistance, if any at all. How different this all is from the past, when religious refugees often found a new country, a new home and work. Furthermore, refugees are often a means of making money, not only for unscrupulous businessmen who sell places on ships or forged papers, but also for countries, which sell refugees, trade in human beings and regard them as political wares.

The hardship suffered by refugees is a disgrace and a challenge. We must do everything possible to help to alleviate this hardship. It is regrettable that the Venice declaration should imply that our resources are not unlimited. Where such suffering exists, other standards must apply.

It is true to say that the refugee problem must be tackled at its roots. But mere appeals to the responsible governments are not enough. It is therefore equally regrettable that the Heads of State or Government evidently did not have the courage to do more than make mere appeals. The tragedies being suffered by refugees are not simply a question of morals. A warning finger is not likely to solve this problem.

My group will therefore be submitting practical proposals and discussing this subject separately in the autumn.

Mr Rinsche will also be making a request this week — on the basis of the ASEAN resolution — for an urgent debate on the refugee problems in this Parliament, with the particular aim of reopening the land bridge between Thailand and Kampuchea, which has been blocked by Vietnamese aggression.

Bertold Brecht, who was himself an emigrant, once said that anyone who has walked through the crowd

in tattered shoes is evidence of the disgrace that besmirches the country from which he has fled. I believe that if the refugee problem is not solved, it will be a disgrace for more than the countries responsible. It will be a disgrace for us all. No one in this House can want that. So let us do our duty.

**President.** — Before I adjourn the sitting, I should like to ask those committees that have arranged meetings for 3 p.m. to delay the start of their meetings for a few minutes in order to wait for the end of this debate.

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, I should like to thank you for the request you have just made to the committees, but I hope that the presidency of the Assembly, which grants or refuses the committees the right to meet, will take the initiative in convening the committee meetings after the President of the Council has replied.

**President.** — It is only an invitation, and I hope that all the committee chairmen will have heard your request.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, forgive me, but what I should like to see is the President informing the chairmen of the committees that they must wait.

**President.** — Your request will be passed on. We shall now suspend our proceedings and resume them at 3 p.m.

The House will rise

*(The sitting was adjourned at 1.05 p.m. and resumed at 3.05 p.m.)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR VANDEWIELE

Vice-President

**President.** — The sitting is resumed.

I call Mr Pannella to speak on a point of order.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, I am very happy to be able to speak again while you are in the Chair. I wish to refer to the Rules of Procedure, while awaiting Mr Thorn's return. I should like to thank you, Mr



**Pannella**

President, for your kindness earlier on and also to recall, for my own benefit principally, that Rule 10 of our Rules of Procedure requires that, when a Member does not do what he should do or disturbs the sitting, the President must call him to order once, twice or three times. I would stress, Mr President, that this possibility exists and that the fact advantage was not taken of it after what happened this morning has great significance.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, there are times when the President, who is no neophyte in this Parliament, prefers not to hear. Certain words have been used which I did not hear and things have been done which I did not see. I must ask you not to go on about this matter.

**8. Urgent procedure**

**President.** — I have received from Mr Israël and others a motion for a resolution with request for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the follow-up to the Geneva International Conference on humanitarian aid to Kampuchea (Doc. 1-301/80/rev.).

The reasons supporting this request are contained in the document itself.

I shall consult Parliament on the urgency of this motion for a resolution tomorrow at the beginning of the sitting.

**9. Agenda**

**President.** — Mr Penders has informed me that he has no objection to the debate on his report on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee on human rights in Poland (Doc. 1-219/80), which is on the agenda for Thursday, being held over until the September part-session, in accordance with the enlarged Bureau's request.

That is therefore agreed.

**10. Council statement on the Luxembourg Presidency (continuation)**

**President.** — I note that the speakers still down to speak in the debate on the Council statement are not present.

I propose that we suspend the sitting for five minutes to await the arrival of the President-in-Office of the Council.

Are there any objections?

I call Lord Harmar-Nicholls.

**Lord Harmar-Nicholls.** — Mr President, I wanted to congratulate you on your efficiency. I believe that you have set a very good example. You appear on time and if Members of Parliament are not here when they ought to be here, then it is their lookout. But I congratulate you. I hope that other presidents will follow your example and then Members of Parliament will know that and they will be here to do their job.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — By taking the chair at 3 p.m. I wanted to show that the President is punctual.

The sitting is suspended.

*(The sitting was suspended at 3.10 p. m. and resumed at 3.15 p. m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is resumed.

I call Mr Thorn.

**Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council** — (F) Mr President, some speakers this morning have reminded me of my past as a Member of this Parliament, my present role as President-in-Office of the Council and even, albeit with the greatest kindness and graciousness, of my future. For the moment, you will appreciate that I prefer to confine myself to my present role. As President-in-Office of the Council I intend to devote all my energies to this task and do not feel authorized to speak of other functions mentioned by certain people. There will be plenty of time to go back to these other matters. I should only like to say to this Parliament, so that there can be no misunderstandings on this subject, even in the press, that the Commission has only one president. He is Mr Roy Jenkins, who has done such enormous work and who has such important responsibilities to bear up to 5 January. I would not like any institution to fall into the trap of thinking that it could have two presidents. The President of the Commission must be invested with all the moral authority he needs and with the entire confidence and trust of those who have the interests of the Community at heart. I think therefore that we need waste no further words quibbling about this matter.

### Thorn

I thank Mr Scott-Hopkins for his kind words in regarding my past as a guarantee of my future resolve to devote myself entirely to the cause of Europe. As of this moment, with the agreement of my government, I am devoting myself entirely to the task of being President-in-Office of the Council of the European Communities. When I have other functions and other responsibilities I shall devote myself to them. And if there should ever be any doubt that one function was interfering with the other, please believe me that I would not hesitate to assume my responsibilities and to carry out the trust reposed in me. We shall have another opportunity to speak of these responsibilities. You must not forget that the President of the Commission has often been asked, before taking up his duties, to take some time to familiarize himself with the problems of the Community and particularly its relations with Parliament. But you will permit me to ask how one can better familiarize oneself with the problems of the Community than by assuming, for the fourth time in a relatively short life, the presidency of the European Communities. How could one better establish contacts with the European Parliament than by attending each of its part-sessions over a period of six months? This is what I intend to do, ladies and gentlemen, and I assure you that we will have an opportunity to discuss all these problems on many occasions.

With regard to energy, Mr Glinne and others have expressed anxiety to see more concrete progress and hear more precise replies. The statement made by the President of the Council when taking up his office cannot, as you will realize, replace the discussions we shall continue to have in different fora on the main problems. For my part, I hope that these debates will be held and that we shall not over-emphasize those questions, however important, which can be more usefully debated in the framework of normal procedures, above all with the Commission. We have spoken of the need to replace oil by other energy products. This is acknowledged today, and we must draw the proper conclusions from it. I note that in this gathering some Members of Parliament, such as Mr Glinne and Mr De Goede, would like to take other options. Some Members are inspired by environmental reasons and others by the potential danger of this or that source of energy. I must remind you that I am not speaking and have not spoken on this matter in my personal capacity. I have analysed the Venice communiqué and given my interpretation of the wishes of the nine Heads of State and Government. Their wishes are clear and as a Community of Nine, whether we like it or not, they have said clearly that they recognize that there is an energy crisis. We must make ourselves independent or at least more independent of oil, and this is why we must reach out for alternative sources of energy. I also feel that when Mr De Goede re-reads my speech he will see that there were not so many differences between himself and myself. He feels that we must begin by energy savings before we proceed to look for alternative sources of energy, and that is

exactly what I said myself this morning. Our No 1 objective must be to save energy and above all to save oil, but since this is not possible to the very great extent that we might wish, we must also, hand in hand with this and immediately, see to it that we become more independent of oil.

With regard to the Seveso directive about which you have asked a question, I should like to say first of all that it has not been shelved entirely, as the Chairman of the Socialist Group said, but that it has been held back to the next Council. I know that people will say that if it has been put back, it is because it did not meet with general agreement. You are right in this, but you must also realize that there are very few directives and there are very few essential problems that are resolved at the first attempt. It is perfectly normal that any question of a certain degree of complexity should be held back and discussed a second time. I shall give you further information on this matter.

With regard to the European Energy Agency, this is certainly a very promising idea. However, it remains to be seen whether a further agency would be justified in addition to the one operating at present. I remember very well that even in this Assembly frequent complaints have been made about the proliferation of measures and the juxtaposition of institutions and agencies. That is why I take the liberty of suggesting to Members that it might be better to take a second look at this matter before doing anything. It is clear that the Community should and can go further than the OECD countries as a whole, but I feel that we must make a careful choice of the areas in question and refrain from raising hopes which we cannot satisfy, as matters stand at present.

With regard to research credits, on which Mr Glinne and others following him dwelt, I feel that it would be a good thing to increase these credits, but I should not like either to do it for any demagogic reasons and to say that we must increase credits, knowing all the time that to add on various credits will only bring us up against another brick wall in a few months time. It is essential therefore in this sector that we coordinate all our actions with what is being done in the Member States. I believe that we just have not got the resources, even the richest amongst us, and we have no longer the time to afford the luxury of duplicated effort.

In a fairly trenchant criticism, Mr Piquet referred to the use of coal. It is true that one of our great ambitions in the energy sector is to maintain and develop coal production in the Community and to find new ways of using this resource, and I am thinking here particularly of gasification. Must we cut out coal imports? If I understood the honourable Member correctly, that was the solution, a rather simplistic one perhaps, that he was advocating. Why should the Community adopt a protectionist policy in coal alone when it continues to import uranium and many other

## Thorn

commodities? If we cut out coal imports in all circumstances, we run the risk of making certain of our finished products even less competitive as against other countries or asking our citizens to cough up an even greater subsidy for national coal, for which our Members of Parliament would subsequently have to take the blame. You realize that this would only be done by means of a costly system of financing and, as European Members of Parliament, you will appreciate how difficult it could be to reach agreement among the governments of the Nine in this matter.

As for inflation, employment and growth, these matters have been spoken of at length and I have reaffirmed the prior importance of the fight against inflation. Mr Piquet and others have alleged a certain negligence or even moral backsliding on my part. He said that we must concentrate entirely on unemployment and make the creation of jobs our all-important task. I recall that Mr Piquet reproached me with the fact that in my entire statement the word 'workers' never figured even once.

I feel that when we speak of growth, every one has his own style of speaking, and this is the case even amongst Liberals. When we speak of growth, development or the fight against inflation, we all have exactly the same goal. When our governments take up the fight against inflation, they are also fighting against long-term unemployment. When we fight for increased growth in our countries, we are fighting for an increase in the number of jobs. Men and women workers are for me quite simply, all the citizens of our countries, and while we may have different educational backgrounds and different preferences, I should like to assure the honourable Member that we are all intent on the same objective.

As far as the budget is concerned and the restructuring of policies, I would recall that the views I expressed this morning made it quite clear that the budget is at the service of the implementation of policies and not their definition alone. That is why I feel that there is a certain danger in restricting ourselves in our choice of policy within the context of the budgetary debate. This is what some people are trying to have us do, and I would warn Parliament, the Commission and all concerned, against limiting their discussions on the choice of policies to a purely budgetary discussion. It is true that afterwards we shall have to find the means to fund the policies selected, and that we shall have to do this in the framework of the budget debate. There will perhaps be revisions and substantial cutbacks, but I feel that the choice of policies should be made independently of budgetary policy. It should be made in advance if possible, or at least simultaneously.

The budget, as you yourselves have found out, can be a stimulus and a guideline, but the pretext of stimulation must not become a threat blocking the smooth operation of the Community. We are currently engaged in reconsidering and restructuring existing

policies. This morning I outlined the nature of one such reconsideration. If the element of Community solidarity were to be abolished or even reduced, there would no longer be such a thing as Community policy, and this is the vital fact. This would undermine considerably the role of Parliament. I must emphasize once more that I reject any so-called policy of *juste retour* but I also believe firmly that the present imbalance in our policies as a whole will, unless some remedy is applied, remain a permanent blocking factor in the elaboration of new policies, however essential these may be for our future development. But when an honourable Member asks, as happened this morning, whether we are still living in a Community where people say: 'I am a net contributor' or 'I am a net beneficiary', he has put his finger on the problem. We must try to be fair to everybody, but it would be very disheartening if our policies were judged solely and strictly by the 'fair return' factor, if everyone wanted to get back exactly what he had given to Community funds in every area and in every policy.

*(Applause from some quarters on the right)*

We are all politicians here, and we can neither criticize nor defend politicians if they ask what efforts the people that sent them, to this Parliament are being obliged to make, what they are being asked to contribute to the Community budget, and what advantages they are deriving from it.

We are amongst politicians who are accustomed to concerning themselves about a fair balance within the Community and about thinking whether the common policies we define are to the advantage of one person or the other or to their detriment. If we are to have genuine Community policies worthy of the name, it is no harm that we should think in terms of fair balances, but I would hope that we would not engage in the sordid calculations of petty grocers.

As far as development policy is concerned, I have said plainly that the Community must always be in the forefront, and that it why I am particularly anxious to see it live up to its reputation as we are about to embark in New York on a new debate on the North-South Dialogue. I am afraid that our governments have not up to now given this meeting the priority it deserves. How would we feel if the Special Session were to add further frustration to all the frustration that has already been suffered and the Third and Fourth Worlds were to find that the entire debate was in vain and that the industrialized countries had come up with no solutions? That would be serious for the world's future. Now, we know that we need not look for any solution to the Eastern countries. Up to now they have never given any substantial aid to the developing countries, except to supply them with arms. We also know that there are other countries that neither have the resources nor the imagination to provide aid. The Community, more than any other body, must give proof of resource and inventiveness, by working out

### Thorn

valid proposals and standing up to defend them in New York. I would be one of the first to acknowledge that the Willy Brandt report is an important contribution, which is based on the thinking expressed in our House. On the basis of this report we must devise practical solutions in the immediate future.

Permit me now, Mr President, to say a few words in reply to the various speakers who have spoken on the problem of enlargement. As is the privilege of all politicians, I had an opportunity to have some discussions in the break between the morning sitting and this afternoon's sitting, and these discussions lead me to fear that some people did not perhaps understand my position very well. The arrangements agreed upon must be put into effect. That is my position, that is the position of the Council, and as of the moment. I am not aware of any other position being held by any of the governments. However, it is a fact that we have not solved all the problems posed by the candidature of the applicant States. I said this morning in my speech that many vital problems are still far from being resolved.

Independently of the problems posed by the applications of Spain and Portugal, there are a certain number of problems still in abeyance amongst ourselves, as you all know. The President of the French Republic has called attention to them, but they existed long before that. I think it is a good thing to call them to mind, because we shall have to face up to them. There may be different interpretations, but the question remains the classic one: is the glass of water half empty or it is half full? Some will tell you that enlargement should not come about before these internal problems have been solved, and others conclude that these problems will go on for a long time. For my part, I would see things differently. Enlargement must come about; on that we are all agreed. We have internal problems quite independently of this enlargement, but these applications will make the problems loom larger. Let us once and for all attack these problems and find a solution for them. We have delayed too long. We can solve them, and go on to achieve enlargement. It is futile to quarrel about one interpretation rather than another; we must finally get to grips with the real problem, which we have neglected for far too long.

On the question of the institutions, I was astonished to hear a British Member say this morning that when one did not know what to talk about, one spoke about the institutional problems. I was slightly abashed, because having always spoken myself of institutional problems, I felt that I was in danger of hearing it said that it was because of my lack of competence in certain specific subjects. However, I stick to my views, and I will begin by saying that there are three major institutional problems. We have all possibly been a little guilty, and I would address myself mainly to those who sat in this Parliament in the sixties. We were a little traumatized by the 'war of religion', by the institutional war of the

years '63 and '65. One hardly dared to even mention the word institution, for fear of putting the Community's very existence in danger.

I feel that this era has been buried by now, but even today one must speak of the institutions. We have mechanisms which are in danger of not adapting adequately to the dimensions of the Community or to their tasks. In this fast-flowing historical current in which we live, I know of no machinery, even the most sophisticated, which does not need to be reviewed and re-examined after 30 years. This is our situation today, and there is no longer any danger of compromising the Community and its fundamental principles. We have to see how we can sharpen our instruments and strengthen the cooperation between institutions with a view to getting better results. I believe that we must have the courage to speak of these matters because if we do not do so before the Community is enlarged to ten, eleven or twelve or any number you like, we shall lose everything. Because we shall have institutions which are not able to meet the demands which we have a right to make on them.

My second point in this connection, ladies and gentlemen, is that I believe that all of us — Council, Parliament and even the Commission — have been guilty of quarrelling amongst ourselves at various levels and in various degrees. We must realize that we are all engaged in the one work and that the institutions were set up to serve the Community and not to be in conflict with each other. We shall get nowhere if we fight one another, but we can if we fight together, each one within the limits of its own powers, to try to advance our common endeavours. I shall be trying to assist Parliament along these lines, in the second half of the year.

Mr Rey made us all sad this morning when he told us that he was about to leave this Parliament. I have always been happy to work under the watchful eye of Jean Rey, who was my mentor in the area of liberal thought, and who was also a Liberal minister, Member of the Commission, and President of the Commission. This morning, Jean Rey criticized the fact that 30 years after the beginning of the Community, the Council of Ministers of this European Community is still in the hands of the Foreign Ministers. He used a charming phrase when he said that this is no longer the era of negotiations, but that the Community must be governed and administered. At the same time, he recalled why the Foreign Ministers were in charge of the Community, and it was because the Foreign Ministers had negotiated the Treaties and when these negotiations were concluded, they simply carried on the work of administration.

It is a fact that Community affairs are no longer purely external affairs, but who will replace the ministers? I would dare to say to my friend, Jean Rey, that I am not entirely in agreement with him when he proposes as an alternative the Ministers for Economic Affairs. I

## Thorn

would add straight away, and speaking personally, that this is certainly not because this is not my own area. In fact, since I held both the portfolio of Economic Affairs and that of Foreign Affairs at the same time, there is no difficulty there as far as I am concerned. However, it is, on the one hand, inaccurate to say that European Community affairs are purely foreign affairs, but then, on the other hand, it would drag down the Community to an unacceptable materialistic level to say that its affairs were purely economic ones. I may add from personal knowledge that it is not the Ministers for Economic Affairs who have been most hard pressed by Community affairs up to the present time.

What is the problem? The problem is that the Community goes far beyond technical matters and encroaches a little on the areas of all ministers. In order to administer, or as you have said, Mr Rey, to govern this Community, you would need a Council made up of people who have the power to decide, who represent the French Government, the President of the Republic, the Federal Chancellor, the Prime Ministers. It might even be Deputy Prime Ministers or Ministers of State, but the important thing is that there should be people who have the power to take decisions around the Council table. That is the nub of the problem. I feel that one of these days, as Leo Tindemans and all those who have been asked to make reports on this matter have advocated, we shall come up with solutions of this kind.

I shall make one last point on this very delicate question. My old colleague, Mr Glinne, took me to task when he brought up all the theoretical and practical problems about the seat of Parliament, its place of work and so on. I would only say to him very simply, though quite seriously, that he will understand that I am here as President-in-Office of the Council and that I must confine myself to my present responsibilities. As President-in-Office and speaking on behalf of the Council, I defend the agreement concluded between the Member States, and I am all in favour of this agreement being strictly observed. I have been alleged to be guilty of some dissembling *vis-à-vis* the Council or one partner or the other, but I would only say that I am a convinced European and at the same time a defender of the interests of my country, which I would never be prepared to sacrifice. I feel that Mr Glinne and all the other speakers will understand this. I am there to defend its rights and I shall defend them all the more vigorously in that I do so with profound faith and conviction. So much then for the question of the seat of Parliament — no doubt we shall have other opportunities of discussing this matter.

I now come to some specific points. My adversary and very good friend, Mr Glinne, asks me if it is true that two Members of Parliament are to be delegated to attend the United Nations Conference on the Rights of Women in Copenhagen. As far as I know, only the Commission, and I speak here under the watchful eye

of its President, has observer status at the United Nations. The Council does not have it. The question was raised at one time in the Council, but it was settled along the lines we have indicated. It is not for the Council to send a delegation, but I think that the Commission was thinking of having some Members of Parliament attend. However, the Commission is better qualified than I to give a reply on this matter.

With regard to the Middle East, I feel that there was perhaps not general but at least majority approval of my remarks. One speaker, however, asked if I would make my tour of the Middle East personally or if I was going to send a trouble-shooter. I did not quite grasp the sense of this word. Does he think that I would put any person 'in trouble'? In Venice, the presidency was asked to fulfil its responsibilities in this matter. As I had the honour to attend this Conference of Heads of State and Government, I, like Mr Jenkins, can reply that I was told that after 1 July it would be for the Luxembourg presidency to take responsibility for this matter, though it could ask for someone else to accompany it, but these are only minor points. I was told that this mission should be at Foreign Minister level, and that I would have to accept responsibility for it. I said this morning that I was prepared to do so, and to do so immediately, because I believe that it is important that we should get a maximum of information from all the parties concerned, as stated in the communiqué, before the Nine confronts the entire world in New York at the meeting of the United Nations. While Venice was a good starting point and the Venice Declaration was welcomed in the vast majority of Member States of the United Nations, it is important that before we take up a position, we should be informed, as confidentially as possible, of the reactions of all parties to the conflict. This is the way it seems to the Heads of State and Government, and I feel that at the conclusion of the coming Council we shall find solutions enabling us to make progress in this matter.

On Iran I have nothing to add. Regrets were expressed that we did not denounce the imperial régime. We are speaking of the present situation. I only spoke of the question of the hostages, and I feel that I spoke on behalf of the Council in very moderate tones, mainly with an eye to the future. I feel that we must turn our attention to present and future problems and this is not the time to encumber this debate with looking back to the past.

Mr Lecanuet asked me if the Council intended to have Spain and Portugal participate in political cooperation. I must recall the basic principles. Being a member of the Community and taking part in political cooperation are two ideas that are closely linked. Up to the present, you could not have one without the other. According as the accession negotiations move forward, formulae for progressively increased participation in political cooperation will be worked out, as,

**Thorn**

in fact, we are doing at the present time in the case of Greese.

I agree to a great extent with Mr Berlinguer when he advocates that dialogue should be kept up between East and West, particularly in the CSCE. That is not just my opinion alone; it is also the opinion of the nine Foreign Ministers and of the Nine Heads of State and Government. I am glad to be able to stress this once again. However, I would claim that this dialogue will be more difficult than was the case before the invasion of Afghanistan. Who would deny that? We continue to be committed to détente, and we have decided by a common agreement of the Nine, that we will go to Madrid, and that we will make preparations for the Madrid meeting.

We have been doing this seriously for some months and we hope that Madrid will be a great success for us all. However, it is going to be more difficult, but that is not our fault. It is the fault of people who understand different things by the word 'détente', because while pledging allegiance to détente they felt able to invade another country. The Community has always played a dynamic role in the proceedings of the CSCE, and I know that we have been criticized, even at the Helsinki Conference, for being too thorough. You can be assured that we shall continue to be so. But I would say to Mr Berlinguer, as I should like to say to all the Members of this Assembly who are worried about the future of détente, that détente is something very sensitive, particularly when one sees that it is interpreted differently in different quarters. That is why I feel that only when we have restored a balance of forces and when the Nine can speak with one voice and give proof of their determination not to accept violations of justice, such as those committed in Afghanistan or other countries, that we shall have once again a worthwhile dialogue in a spirit of loyalty, generosity and frankness and in a serious manner. We have no worthwhile dialogue and we make no worthwhile progress as long as we have misunderstandings, deceptions and equivocation. We shall do everything we can to put a stop to these.

Mr Alber also spoke about the problem of the refugees. I would say straight away that if he re-reads the communiqué issued by Venice II, he will see that this subject was mentioned. I would remind him also that the Community, through its material aid, contributes to alleviating to some slight extent the excessively sad state of these refugees. The Member States have welcomed numerous refugees and continue to do so. I realize that this is not enough.

We can only hope that each one will prove more generous in future. But let us not deceive ourselves on this matter. Generosity is one thing, the legal problems encountered in this matter are another, and it will not be easy to resolve them. The Community and the Ministers meeting in political cooperation have this problem very much at heart. These are not just empty

words, because I can assure you that no meeting of the Foreign Ministers in political cooperation passes without this problem being discussed. Much has been achieved, even if this is not always evident to the public gaze.

Mr President, I should like to thank Parliament and those Members who have spoken in this debate for having given me the opportunity to clarify matters somewhat. I am sorry if I was not able to answer all these questions. I hope that in the future I shall have the opportunity to take matters a little further.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — Mr President-in-Office of the Council, on behalf of the entire Parliament I should like once again to thank you for the warmth with which you have replied to the numerous questions put to you. I am one of those who knew you when you came under other circumstances to attend the meetings of this Parliament, and we have always admired your vigour and your warm humanity. We hope that the Presidency now commencing will be a very fruitful time for the Communities and also for the European Parliament. Thank you very much, Mr President.

The debate is closed.

#### 11. *Amendment of Parliament's Rules of Procedure*

**President.** — The next item is the debate on the report by Mr Luster, on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, amending the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament (Doc. 1-148/80/fin./corr.II).

I call Mrs Vayssade to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group

**Mrs Vayssade.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, here we are again, as at the beginning of 1979, debating the Rules of Procedure, a debate that will again be far from complete. The Socialists have found little they like in this second Luster report. These fragmentary revisions, following some problem that has arisen during a part-session, are not a good way of going about things. They are reactions to events in the Chamber. They do not permit general reflection on the role and the functioning of this Parliament.

The previous Assembly knew that the problem was a political one when it refused to vote on new provisions for the Parliament that was about to be elected. It also knew that this newly elected Assembly would face new problems. Continuing to make piecemeal additions to ill-suited Rules of Procedure will not solve our problem.

## Vayssade

The Committee on the Rules of Procedure has begun this general review, but there is a danger that it will never complete this work and will revert to piecemeal revisions if requests for changes as a matter of urgency are constantly being made. There is also the situation in which the same rule, Rule 14 for example, is considered several times: we discussed Rule 14 in November and we shall be discussing it again today and tomorrow. I know that every Assembly must constantly adapt its rules of procedure, but I believe it does so after generally deliberating on the spirit of those rules. We have not yet done this in this newly elected Parliament, and as long as we go on discussing small, piecemeal reports, we shall have the same problems as we are now facing.

I also have a second preliminary remark to make. We do not really understand what precise role the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and the enlarged Bureau play in the functioning of this Parliament. The procedure adopted for this second Luster report seems completely ambiguous to me, and this includes the decision to hold it over from the June part-session without the appropriate committee being consulted. Knowing who decides how things should be done is one of the problems in this Parliament.

And now to the report itself. We are not satisfied with it in its present form. It is a poor compromise between conflicting tendencies in this Parliament, between those who want more individual rights for Members to the detriment of the groups and certain working methods and those who would like far stricter Rules of Procedure, with greater powers for the Bureau and the presidency. I also feel that the report is too much a reflection of this second tendency and that we are heading in this Parliament towards — dare I say it? — a presidential, far too presidential a system. It must not be forgotten that a parliamentary assembly consists of its members and not only of a bureau.

The report concerns two rules: Rule 14 on urgent debates and Rule 26(3) on explanations of vote. It has become clear from certain debates, more so to some Members than to others, that these procedures are time-consuming, that we are wasting valuable time on them which should be devoted to other debates. It also seems to me that they are the expression of the right of Members to take the initiative and to make their opinions known. The debate on this report must take account of these two requirements, efficiency and democracy, which questions the validity of many other rules of the Rules of Procedure, and we are going to feel frustrated over the next two days.

Rule 14 makes it possible for the Community organs — the Commission, Council and Parliament itself, through its President, groups and members — to hold urgent debates on subjects not originally included in the agenda.

The introduction of such debates means that events

have occurred between the fixing of the agenda and the start of the part-session or that events have occurred even while we are sitting. It is, in fact, essential in such cases that Parliament should be able to react quickly and, if necessary, express its opinion. But there should also be agreement on what is urgent. This procedure has perhaps been used in various cases more to allow Parliament to take initiatives, particularly in the field of political cooperation, than to discuss cases of genuine urgency, because, where urgency is not adopted, the matter concerned is referred to the appropriate committees for further consideration.

The existing procedures must therefore be reviewed with the aim of enabling Parliament to take rapid decisions. The case for urgency is that Parliament needs at least several weeks to take action, after which the problem arising during a part-session ceases to be a problem or the circumstances are completely different at the next part-session. Parliament must therefore be able to adopt a position immediately. Such are the problems connected with urgency. All other matters should be referred to the appropriate committee, pursuant to Rule 25, so that they can be thoroughly examined like all other subjects which fall within Parliament's terms of reference.

If the urgency procedure is to be accepted and to be efficient, we feel the debate on the vote on urgency should be abolished, that written explanations supporting the request for urgency should accompany the text in question and that 24 hours later a vote should be taken solely on the issue of urgency. This would obviate the ambiguity of a debate which never exclusively concerns urgency and is not a debate on the substance either, but merely touches the surface. This would also make for a more valuable debate on the subject when it is included in the agenda. In this connection, I feel that urgent debates should not be placed as a matter of course on the agenda for Friday morning, when matters which may be important for European affairs or for human rights are discussed before an almost empty House.

In this way, if agreement can be reached on this, we feel that the right of parliamentarians, who have represented the citizens of Europe since the elections by universal suffrage and who express the various concerns of those citizens, would be respected, that we would avoid having various sterile and ambiguous debates and also that we could take debates on matters of genuine urgency more seriously and attach to them the importance they deserve. So much for Rule 14.

The second rule we have to consider is Rule 26(3). This concerns the right of Members to explain why they have voted in a certain way, a right that is recognized in all our parliaments. It is a right that is granted both to political groups and to individual Members. It is true to say that where individual Members explain the way they have voted, it is usually because they have voted in an unexpected way, perhaps contrary to

**Vayssade**

their general custom or unlike other members of the group to which they belong, or because they have changed their minds during the debate and wish to explain to their colleagues why this change of heart. The explanation of vote is thus always a means of eliminating misunderstandings.

But when the vote is taken, the debate on the substance has finished. In general, even where there are complaints about a shortage of time for certain debates, everyone has had time to explain the views he is defending. Explanations of vote cannot therefore be, and must not be, a means of reopening a debate on the substance of the matter, since the debate is closed.

I am well aware that our voting system, especially the system of voting times, separated from the debate itself, often makes both debating and voting conditions difficult and that it is sometimes hard to follow exactly what line some of our voting is taking. This only goes to show how difficult it is to deal with one rule without questioning all the other mechanisms of the Rules of Procedure, but even if we have a system under which we are sometimes forced to listen to rather long explanations and which I personally find unsatisfactory, I do not believe that too much time should be given over to explanations of vote. We therefore feel that the right of explanation should be limited to some extent. We consequently agree to Members' speaking time being reduced on two conditions: explanations must be given orally in such a way that they can be understood by the whole Assembly, and they must be given before the vote.

We do not think it would a good thing for the President to have the power to decide if explanations should be given orally or in writing, and we therefore request that they automatically be given orally, unless the speaker has not observed the deadline for making a request to give an explanation.

The last rule which it is proposed should be revised is Rule 31A. The amendment concerned is merely a matter of form, the aim being to ensure that the wording of Rule 31A corresponds to the amended form of Rule 26(3) regarding speaking time. We feel that this rule should not be amended any further during this debate or that it should not be amended with undue haste, since it concerns very important matters to do with the right of Members both to speak and to make personal statements, to speak on amendments and so on. Rule 31A must therefore retain its purely formal nature if the amendments to Rule 26(3) are adopted. Let us not start a debate that takes us further.

That then, Mr President, is the opinion of the Socialist Group on this report. If the amendments we have tabled are adopted, we shall approve them, but without enthusiasm. We shall approve them without enthusiasm, because we feel that some of the problems they deal with will come up again when we get down to the general revision and that we will have perhaps worked

to no avail in the months since the enlarged Bureau made its request. Cannot we save time by having a proper debate on the role and the functioning of this Parliament, one year after the first European elections? That would have seemed more useful to us than these piecemeal revisions.

**President.** — I call Mr Adonnino to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

**Mr Adonnino.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I think it is as well to recall that the debate today and tomorrow's vote are the result of a request from the Bureau to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions that, following the drafting and adoption of certain urgent amendments to the Rules of Procedure last autumn and pending the completion by the committee of the general revision, it should amend the points that figure on today's agenda.

I agree with Mrs Vayssade when she says that this poses a question, that is, the role to be played by Parliament's Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions with regard to the Bureau's proposal. That is something that I too wanted to ask, although I realize of course that any comments or debate on the problem and a solution to it will have to wait for another day.

Be that as it may, I am sure that the work the committee is doing in completely revising the Rules of Procedure will provide Parliament with appropriate and well-defined Rules of Procedure. Needless to say, the existing Rules must be the starting point, with changes being introduced as required.

I believe, as others have suggested, that we might very usefully draw on the practice in the various national Parliaments, but only up to a point, because we must constantly bear in mind that this Parliament has its own special character and the difference between it and the national Parliaments lies, as much as anything, in the way its working methods are constrained by its composition. We have to remember that this House meets for one week — which in practical terms means five days — in every month, the rest of the time being set aside for committee work and political group meetings. Since our time is so short, we need Rules of Procedure that will make for smooth conduct of our business and indicate which bodies should deal more fully with particular matters. Personally I am thinking of the committees, but this is something that will have to be decided in the context of the general revision of the Rules of Procedure.

For the time being we have to focus our attention on just two points: requests for urgent debate (Rule 14) and explanations of vote (Rule 26). The proposed amendment to Rule 31A — and here again I agree



**Adonnino**

with Mrs Vayssade — is a purely technical one to take into account the new wording of Rule 26. As the speaking item for explanations of vote is now covered by Rule 26, the reference to it in Rule 31A must be deleted to avoid repetition.

The problem of urgency, Mr President, is a problem peculiar to this Parliament and yet another consequence of the way we work and of the fact that we meet for one week in every month, so that there is an interval of three and sometimes four weeks between part-sessions. Clearly, therefore, if Parliament is to be able to express an opinion on events that occur in those intervening weeks and before they lose their immediacy, urgent procedure has to be used. While I am bound to agree with those who say that this procedure is abused from time to time — that is to say, instead of being used to help highlight matters of an urgent nature it has been used to draw attention to the need to debate matters of wide political significance that had been omitted from the agenda — it is nevertheless true that our Parliament needs a procedure of this kind. That being the case, we must have suitable rules to which, even if they fall short of perfection, even if they do not succeed in striking an ideal balance between each individual Member's right to speak and table motions at any time and the need to conduct our proceedings smoothly and rapidly, are still an acceptable compromise. It seems to me that Mr Luster's proposal is the best of the available solutions.

That is why we in the Group of the European People's Party endorse Mr Luster's proposal, although we are quite prepared to look at any suggestions from any quarter for changes that might lead to a better solution. I shall be coming back to this point in a moment.

Mr President, I have tabled an amendment, No 56, the purpose of which is to amplify Mr Luster's proposal, because I believe it is right to make the point that the rules on urgent procedure must not be allowed to interfere with the preparation of the agenda (Rule 12(2)), with the procedure relating to oral questions without debate and oral questions with debate (Rules 46 and 47), and with the debate on answers to questions (Rule 47B). My amendment therefore seeks to embody that stipulation in Mr Luster's proposals.

The problem is this. In cases of urgency should there be a debate in Parliament or not? It goes without saying that any debate that may be held must relate to urgent procedure and not to the substance of the matter, which will be the subject of a separate debate later on. We agree with Mr Luster that a decision on urgency should be taken without debate unless urgency is contested in writing by a certain number of Members, in which case a very brief debate would be held with just the author of the request and one speaker against being heard.

I do think it is wise to leave the decision as to when to place the debate on the agenda to the president's discretion, since it is he who is responsible for the smooth conduct of business and who knows best where to insert the extra debate, which inevitably alters the planned agenda. I also think that requests for urgent procedure should be put to the vote at voting time, following the custom in this Parliament, and that a certain number of votes should be required before urgent procedure can be adopted. It has been proposed, as a way of emphasizing the importance of the matter in hand, that at least half the Members — 206 — need to be present and that at least one third — that is 137 — need to vote in favour.

I also agree with the proposal that, where several requests for urgent debate on the same subject are received, they should be dealt with together, since the arguments for and against urgency in any particular case must essentially be the same. Again in the interests of the smooth conduct of business, I am in favour of the proposal not to allow explanations of vote on matters of urgency, which are in effect procedural motions and as such already covered by our Rules of Procedure, but which we shall in any case be looking at more closely in the context of the general revision of the Rules. Furthermore, if the House were to request a vote by roll-call, it should be taken using the electronic voting system.

Mr President, I have said that we support Mr Luster's proposal in this connection. We know that there are other proposals, some of which are no doubt worthy of consideration and we shall be able to look at them when we come to vote. One proposal would in effect remove the decision from the Assembly's powers, since the request for urgent debate would be posted on the notice-board for signature by Members. If, let us say, a request for urgency were to be supported by the signatures of one-third — that is, 137 — of the Members, or by four political group chairmen — who obviously would have the backing of many of their colleagues — it would be granted automatically and the President would place it on the agenda. This idea has less appeal for us. Given the importance of the question of urgency, we should prefer the House to take the decision by a qualified majority, even if without debate. However, we do not entirely rule out a solution along these lines.

Let us turn now briefly to Rule 26. It seems to me that the Luster report makes an extremely important distinction between the final statement made by the spokesman for a political group at the conclusion of a debate and the explanation of vote given by an individual Member.

As Mrs Vayssade observed earlier, this problem has arisen basically because some Members have interpreted the explanation of vote, also in theoretical terms, as a legitimate extension of the debate. This argument has already assumed special relevance in this

**Adonnino**

Parliament, since Rule 28 of the Rules of Procedure restricts every Member's speaking time. It was thought that anyone who, in giving an explanation of vote, eluded Rule 28, would still be subject to that Rule when making a general statement. The problem presented by Rule 28 is a serious one which will have to be discussed some other time. Its importance is due, among other things, I believe, to the fact that Parliament sits only five days in the month so that its business must be strictly ordered, but without infringing the rights of individual Members.

I believe — and hope — that in future there will be less need to invoke Rule 28, if we succeed in finding other ways of reducing our workload and cutting down on the number of items on the agenda for each part-session. However, as regards individual explanations of vote — as distinct from the final statements in which the political groups can give their reasons for adopting a particular position — we reject the idea that they can be used to extend the debate. It must be made quite clear that an explanation of vote is intended solely to enable a Member to express his disagreement with the vote and thereby prevent any possible misunderstanding of his voting behaviour.

I realize, Mr President, that it is extremely difficult to translate such a highly theoretical notion satisfactorily into practical terms, as it would probably require the President to take a very hard line with Members. For this reason we are seeking to get round the problem another way. Once the idea of final statements by the political groups has been introduced, we think — even if we are not altogether keen on the idea — that it would be better for individual Members to give their explanations of vote after the result of the voting has been announced. I am aware that this is a highly controversial point. A few moments ago we heard he spokesman for the Socialist Group expressing their opposition to such a proposal and I quite understand their arguments. Perhaps the solution put forward by Mr Luster and taken up again in one of my amendments, No 55, is still the best. Needless to say, if we accept this proposal we must also accept that the President should have the power at any time to invite Members — or instruct them, if their names have not been entered on the list in time — to give written explanations of vote not exceeding 150 words, which will subsequently be published with the minutes of proceedings as a record of their position.

Mrs Vayssade mentioned the proposal to limit the statements by the political groups to three minutes and those of individual Members to one and a half minutes. I think this is an extremely sensible proposal and, as such, deserves to be adopted. Those then are our thoughts on the matter, although, as I say, when we come to vote, we might be prepared to accept the other suggestions I referred to, subject to the qualifications I mentioned. I hope that this debate may lead to a clearer understanding of the various attitudes so that when we come to vote tomorrow we can be sure

of adopting those changed in the Rules of Procedure that, from a practical point of view, are most likely to help us get through our business as smoothly as possible.

**President.** — I call Mr Patterson to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Patterson.** — Mr President, could I start somewhat controversially by agreeing with something Mr Pannella said yesterday, that is, to protest at the way this particular debate is being treated. It is being treated rather like the traditional poor relation moved from house to house, and in June we even lost our rapporteur. Indeed, I do not quite see how this afternoon we are going to move 172 amendments. I am going to have to move 15 in my short speech. Could I also say that some time ago the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions firmly took the decision never to have any more of these emergency or urgent reports. It was, however, at the request of the enlarged Bureau that we did so and not of our own volition. Now, to the point of substance, we are dealing with two matters — the matter of urgency and the matter of explanations of vote. Mrs Vayssade referred to the need for a balance between order and liberty, something which I mentioned when we last debated the Rules. We are clearly dealing with two abuses of present procedures. In the matter of urgency, as speakers have already said, what has been happening is that instead of debating urgent procedure first thing in the morning, we have been debating the substance of the matter itself. That is because the Rules of Procedure allow a spokesman from each group to get up and make a little speech. As regards explanations of vote, instead of having pure explanations, we have been reopening the debate. In both cases it amounts to an abuse of our procedures. But let us be quite clear, they both have a similar cause. And here once again I agree with Mr Pannella. The reason why this is happening is the use made of Rule 28 on speaking time, which has been steadily squeezing the ability of people to speak in the debates themselves, and the virtual abolition, because of pressure of time, of any debates or questions under Rules 46, 47 or 47B. What we have been witnessing in this House is rather like a balloon. If you have a full balloon and you push it in at one point it will pop out at another point, and this is why really we are having to do something about urgent debates and explanations of vote.

It all serves to illustrate how wise the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions was to say that we should undertake a general revision of the Rules because all rules hang together, and that, of course, is something we are doing.

Meanwhile, however, we have in front of us this particular report. To start off with Rule 14, the original purpose of this rule, and I think we ought to be clear

## Patterson

about this, was not in order to hold urgent debates on resolutions but in order that Parliament could express its opinion on matters which were coming before the Council of Ministers but on which no committee report had yet been concluded. That was the original purpose of Rule 14. However, it is being used increasingly in order to hold these little debates first thing in the morning and a whole scramble of debates on resolutions late on Friday. The report, therefore, is intended to do something to remedy this situation. In my opinion the most important element of this report is that we should have time to consider requests for urgent debate before we vote on them. At the moment groups have no time to discuss the matters in hand, and sometimes we have to vote when the documents have just been placed on our tables as we come into the Chamber. Therefore the suggestion that we should have a clear 24 hours between the distribution of the documents and the vote on urgent procedure is in my opinion most important.

Then we have the matter of speeches on urgent procedure. It is clear that a great deal of time is spent on this, and there are three proposals in the report and in the draft amendments. Mr Sieglerschmidt's Amendment No 43 would have no speeches at all. Mr D'Angelosante's amendment No 8 would always have two speeches, and Mr Luster's proposal is that we should have two speeches if there were any contest. It seems to me that Mr Luster's report, therefore, has hit the happy medium on this issue, though my group would be satisfied with either of the other two proposals.

The final element is that in order for urgent procedure to be adopted, one-third of the Members would have to vote for it. This is something which is slightly more controversial and my group again has not exactly made up its mind on the matter, although if everybody else agrees that one-third should be necessary before urgent procedure can be adopted, we would vote for that proposal.

We have two criticisms as regards the existing text. First of all, we clearly must vote for Mr Adonnino's amendment No 56 since the Rules would otherwise exclude all questions. Moreover, we must delete the matter about roll-call votes only being electronic because fast experience of the electronic apparatus in this and other chambers has shown what can happen if it does not work.

There is, however, a further draft amendment, tabled in the name of Mr Nord, about which my colleague, Mr Tyrell, will speak later on. We are very much attracted by this amendment because it does introduce the element of the register. It was originally a proposal of my group in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions that there should be a register for urgent debates, and I notice that the enlarged Bureau voted for this concept by 12 votes to 3. There are one or two aspects of this proposal by Mr Nord, however,

on which I would like further clarification, particularly as to whether, if several proposals are made for a debate on the same subject, we have got to have several registers, or several votes, because I do not believe the translation of Mr Nord's original text is altogether accurate.

Turning now to the matter of explanations of vote, it is here that we have met with extreme difficulty. What is the purpose of explanations of vote? In my country there is no such thing in our parliamentary practice, and we have been at great pains to discover from the various people who do have such a practice what is meant by such an explanation.

First of all, it is quite clear that in what we would call a winding-up speech there is every justification for making a final statement. Clearly, as in the budget, when there has been a long series of votes on amendments, it is very useful to have the spokesman of each political group sum up the point of view of the group before the final vote is taken.

But what about individuals — and this brings us to the question whether explanations of vote come before or after the vote? Now, at first sight my group has found it quite incomprehensible how one can possibly explain something before one has actually done it, which is why we have consistently called for explanations of vote to be delivered after the vote. However, we do understand that this is not in accordance with the parliamentary traditions of a number of other countries and indeed that it would be unlikely to command the support of the majority of Members of this House. Therefore, we are willing, as my amendment, No 19, states, to concede that explanations of vote should come before rather than after the final vote.

Finally, we come to the question whether they should be oral or in writing. Clearly, if the purpose of an explanation of vote is to remove a misunderstanding, which might be reported in the press, then it does not matter very much whether one delivers it orally or whether one writes it down afterwards and has it included in the record. We would support the half-way position whereby explanations of vote should, in principle, be oral but where, if it looks as though the whole debate is being reopened again and there are endless explanations of vote, it should be at the discretion of the President to decide that remaining explanations should be in writing.

I have tabled, in the name of my Group, a completely new text on this matter of Rule 26 (3) for a number of reasons. The proposal made by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, that is Mr Luster's proposal, is that there should first of all be a preliminary notice of explanations of vote, with a cut-off when the first explanation of vote has begun. This is clearly right. It enables individuals to listen to their group spokesmen and, if they disagree with them, to put their names in to deliver an explanation of vote.

**Patterson**

The final statements, I agree, should be limited to three minutes, which brings us to the question of when the explanation of vote should be. The Luster report says: 'After the final vote: 1½ minutes'. This I have already dealt with.

The President may decide that they should be taken in writing. The words 'taking account of the situation' appear to us rather odd. It is difficult to believe that the President would not take account of the situation in making such a decision and, indeed, any words on this matter appear to us superfluous, and so we would delete that and leave the matter to the discretion of the President.

The Luster report also makes the provision that if one has missed the deadline one can still make written explanations of vote. We think that this is really superfluous, since we cannot believe that if you really wished to make an explanation of vote you could not have put your name on the President's list in time, and therefore my amendment would delete this.

As regards the purpose of an explanation of vote, in order to avoid any misunderstanding the Luster report does provide a definition. However, we rather tended to agree with Mr D'Angelosante's suggestion that an explanation of vote should be given when a Member disagrees with what his/her group's spokesman has said. None the less, it appears to us in the last resort that any definition of an explanation of vote is probably going to give rise to more trouble than it is worth, and therefore my amendment would delete any definition of an explanation of vote.

The final matter, and this is important, is that there should be a provision in the Rule that if there have been explanations of vote and then, because of the quorum being called, no vote is held, there should not be a whole lot of other explanations of vote the next day when the vote is finally taken, and that is what my amendment seeks to ensure.

In conclusion, Mr President, might I remind the House that for this report to go through at all we need 206 positive votes. No Group is going to get everything it wants. My Group does not expect to do so. We hope in fact that it may be possible to seek an agreement between all groups in this House whereby we can adopt possibly Mr Nord's amendment and possibly my amendment, which would then form the substantive motion which everyone can support. Unless there is some compromise, this debate and all the work of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and, indeed, the work of this House in voting on 172 amendments will produce nothing, and so I plead for a spirit of compromise.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella to speak on a point of order.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, I would appeal to your wisdom and experience to tell me what I should do in the situation in which I find myself.

At this moment, in the Committee on Development and Cooperation, of which I am deputy rapporteur, voting is going on and will continue for some hours. Here I have 108 amendments to present, and I am down to speak in three minutes, after three other speakers have had the floor. I should after all hear what the others have to propose. As I personally feel that this is not a parliamentary situation — but perhaps that is due to my limitations and not to an objective view of things — I ask you, Mr President, what I should do.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, even my wife does not ask me what she should do.

(Laughter)

However, in order to help you, I am prepared to put back your speech for a little. Perhaps another member or a friend could tell you when you are due to speak...

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Mr President, having heard how you deal with Members, I am not surprised your wife does not ask you for advice.

(Laughter and cries)

**President.** — I call Lord Harmar-Nicholls.

**Lord Harmar-Nicholls.** — Mr President, the point that Mr Pannella has made has no substance. I know of no parliament where the dilemma of trying to be in two places does not exist. It is for him to sort out his own priorities and not to expect the whole Parliament to adapt itself to his time-table.

(Laughter)

**President.** — We shall resume the debate.

I call Mr Chambeiron to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

**Mr Chambeiron.** — (F) Although I shall try to be very brief, I should like to protest very strongly against the unacceptable conditions in which the majority of the enlarged Bureau is forcing us to debate the Luster report. But can we really speak of a debate when it is so truncated and speaking time is measured so parsimoniously? When our predecessors were making changes to our Rules of Procedure by a qualified majority, there can be no doubt that they considered

## Chameiron

the matter sufficiently important not to leave it to chance or chance majorities. For them, most certainly, amendments to the Rules of Procedure could only be the outcome of a full discussion, of a genuine dialogue. Today, dialogue is being refused, and without dialogue there is no real democracy. The Luster report concerns the freedom of expression of each and every one of us, which is the subject of an unacceptable restriction.

In his explanatory statement the rapporteur endeavours to justify this serious attack on Members' rights by explaining that his concern is to ensure the smooth conduct of business during part-sessions and observance of the time-table. I am sorry that the rapporteur showed a lack of curiosity in not seeking out the reasons why our business is not conducted in the way he thinks it should be. He would have had no difficulty in establishing that the inconsistencies which are too often a feature of our part-sessions are mostly due to action taken by his Group. Since July of last year the abuse of the urgency procedure is entirely attributable to the fact that a majority of this Assembly has upset agendas to include debates on matters which in no way fall within the European Assembly's terms of reference. On the grounds that they are defending human rights, but too often with politicians' ulterior motives, they have cluttered our agendas. This week we shall again be called upon to consider a report on human rights in Poland, at the very time when the press is telling us that an international conference on human rights has just been held in Warsaw and was attended by an eminent member of the Liberal and Democratic Group, who himself presented Mr Gierk with the medal of the Institute of Human Rights. If absurdity killed, imagine what slaughter there would be in this Assembly. When, on the other hand, have we devoted the necessary time to a discussion of matters as serious as employment, the textile industry, the steel industry — subjects which are of immediate concern to the peoples of the Community — or human rights in the Community itself? Rules of Procedure are not worth having if there is not at the same time a real will to keep our debates within reasonable limits, and that is what seems to be lacking in this Assembly.

I should like to refer briefly to the two rules concerned here. Rule 14 covers the urgency procedure. In all parliaments the declaration of urgency is linked to the idea of exceptional circumstances. I realize that the proposal is not to delete this rule but to amend it so that, by applying the quorum ruling in the new second paragraph of Rule 14, the EPP and the Conservatives, whose elective affinities are known to us all, are sole masters of the procedure. As regards Rule 26, the proposed new wording is not only peculiar; I would say it is absurd. The spirit of logic cannot be said to have inspired this text. Was it not the President of this Assembly herself who last month stated that every Member had a right to give an explanation of vote and that such explanations should be given before the

voting on the text as a whole. With the new version of Rule 26 only a speaker expressing the views of the Group to which he belongs would have this right. Shades of opinion would no longer be permitted in this Assembly, the aim also being to deny the fact that the multinational groups are made up of representatives whose opinions may legitimately differ.

To summarize, the proposal is simple: the right of some to express their views on subjects of their choice and the right of others to silence. This is truly unacceptable, ladies and gentlemen. We have tabled amendments to try and correct this interference with parliamentary rights. But we are too devoted to the freedom of each individual, which we shall never confuse with the abuse of liberty, to deny that we shall without hesitation vote against the text in the form in which it has been presented to us.

**President.** — I call Mr Nord to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Nord.** — (NL) Mr President, although my Group does not agree with the proposals contained in the Luster report, I will begin by thanking Mr Luster for the work he has done in drawing up this report. He has not had it easy; the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions is not the easiest committee in Parliament, and being that committee's rapporteur is not the easiest task imaginable. In addition, the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions did not act on its own initiative, but at the urgent request of Parliament's Bureau. Although my group does not, then, agree with the content of Mr Luster's proposals, I feel we owe him a vote of thanks.

We are dealing here with the second partial revision of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau having felt that it must give priority to certain rules and the Committee on the Rule of Procedure that it could not ignore a request from the Bureau. This is a pity, because the committee would have preferred a general revision. A general revision will no doubt be made one day, but it will take a great deal of time. I am not therefore sure that this second partial revision will be the last before we can proceed to a general revision of the whole of the Rules of Procedure.

This report by Mr Luster deals with two issues, the urgency procedure covered by Rule 14 and explanations of vote covered by Rule 26. In the few minutes allocated to my group I should like to explain its position on the urgency procedure. Mr Galland will then state our views on Rule 26.

We are not happy with the proposals put forward by the committee on the Rules of Procedure on Rule 14. There is no doubt that the urgency is abused in Parliament. As Mr Chameiron has already said, we lose an average of one and a half hours a day on mock

## Nord

debates which are supposed to concern the reason for urgency, but in fact deal with the merits of the matter itself, after which the merits of the matter are again debated on the Friday before empty benches. The Groups — my own not excluded — are themselves principally to blame for this abuse, since they feel they have to compete with each other: if one Group has tabled an urgent resolution, the others want to, and so on.

This abuse can be stopped in two ways, either through self-discipline or by amending the Rules of Procedure. Self-discipline does not exist, so we face the need to amend the Rules of Procedure. But we are not happy with the way the Luster report proposes we should make these amendments. In our opinion, it is not right to raise the question of urgency again and simply to try to limit the number of people who may be involved. We feel it would be better — and in this we derive our inspiration from earlier amendments tabled by Mr Blaney, Mr Coppieters and others — if a written procedure were adopted for the tabling of resolutions for which an urgent debate is requested, on the understanding that the required number of signatures had been obtained.

We would also like to make a distinction between proposals for urgency and requests for urgency. Requests for urgency would concern resolutions dealt with in Parliament, while proposals for urgency would come from the President of the Council or Commission and would usually concern matters which were urgent and on which Parliament's opinion was sought during the part-session. We feel a distinction should be made between these two types of urgency, because the abuse does not occur when Parliament is consulted by the Council or Commission in this way, but when resolutions are tabled. We therefore believe a written procedure should be introduced for this. Every Member of Parliament must have the right to make a request for urgency, but if he does not find the necessary support, Parliament's time should not be wasted any further. This is the essence of Amendment No 59, which we have tabled on Rule 14. Mr Galland will explain my Group's position on Rule 26.

**President.** — I call Mrs Dekker.

**Mrs Dekker.** — (NL) Mr President, we are not entirely happy with this latest revision of the Rules of Procedure. In this respect, we do not stand alone, to judge by the enormous number of amendments that have been tabled, and not all of them, by the way, have come from these back benches.

Like any mandatory arrangement, our Rules of Procedure should reflect a general sense of justice felt by those to whom they apply, in this case the Members of this Parliament. For this the votes of a simple majority are not enough, because these Rules also apply to the

minorities. In parliamentary rules of procedure a balance must be found between suitable organization of business on the one hand and the assurance that each Member can fulfil the mandate he has received from his constituents, on the other hand.

Parliamentary rules of procedure must therefore be formulated in such a way that business can be conducted efficiently and well. On the other hand, they must safeguard democratic decision-making procedures to enable individual Members to do their duty towards their constituents.

The amendments proposed here touch on the very essence of the means open to Members to express their views, namely the raising of topics by means of the urgency procedure and explaining their reasons for voting in a certain way.

In any parliament there must be a means of reacting promptly to developments in society, especially where not acting immediately is equivalent to no longer being able to act or no longer needing to act. The only means our Rules of Procedure provides in this case is the urgency procedure. In its present form this procedure is undoubtedly capable of improvement, but not every change signifies improvement.

This is certainly true of the amendment now being proposed, according to which a sizeable quorum will be required before a request for the application of the urgency procedure can be accepted. When we remember that, because of our calendar, translation and so on, it takes at least several months for a matter to pass through the committee stage, the only other possibility open to us, it is surely obvious that there is a danger of approval of the amendments in the proposed form resulting in inflexibility and inertia in this Parliament. I find the suggestion made by Mrs Vayssade that the vote and the debate should be combined in the case of the urgency procedure extremely valuable. It is, to put it mildly, very disappointing that the alternatives which have been proposed for this basic question and which were also raised in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, including the register system which Mr Nord is now proposing in an amendment, have not been considered in greater detail.

In order not to make the mountain of amendments even higher, I have confined myself to proposing a change in the amendments to Rule 26.

In my Amendment No 33 I have as far as possible retained the existing arrangements, such as the procedure for the submission of requests for approval to make an explanation of vote and the possibility of submitting a written motivation after the final vote. The elements of the proposed text which are at complete variance with the principles we introduced the last time the Rules of Procedure were amended — I am referring to the unjustified and non-functional distinction between explanations of vote before and

**Dekker**

after the voting, which is based entirely on whether or not such explanations come from a political group in the sense indicated by our Rules of Procedure — would be eliminated by my amendment.

To leave it to the President alone to decide whether an explanation of vote should be given orally or in writing is also a less than satisfactory solution.

The amendments proposed in the report clearly reflect the efforts being made to restrict the opportunities of Members of this Parliament to express their views.

Does the report even begin to establish present needs or the reasons why Members try to have new items placed on the agenda or to give their own personal explanations of vote? Not in the least. No more than seven members of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure were in favour of the amendments proposed in this report, and their reasons were very tenuous. So we are now having a debate which, in terms of the procedure being followed, is certainly no example of satisfactory decision-making.

Ironically, the report does not give an answer to the questions which are raised by Mrs Van den Heuvel's resolution and form the basis of this report.

Mr President, today we have again had frequent appeals from various sides for the review of the Rules of Procedure, which is needed to adapt our procedures to the political realities of this new Parliament, not to be carried out in this fragmentary way, but for thorough preparations to be made, because otherwise we run the risk of finishing up with a patchwork of inconsistent *ad hoc* provisions. I should once again like to express my full support for this plea. In organizing our activities, we must also consider our working conditions, particularly as regards the places where Parliament works. After all, it is obvious that many of the problems connected with the organization of our work have to do with this aspect and cannot therefore be solved by some provision in our Rules of Procedure.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (*I*) Mr President, Rule 29 (1), third subparagraph, reads as follows:

'Parliament shall not deliberate on any amendment unless it is moved during the debate.'

Mr President, I have one minute and forty-five seconds in which to speak in the debate — since we are at present debating — but I also have 108 amendments to move. According to our Rules of Procedure, unless I move them they cannot be put to the vote. Fortunately, or unfortunately, these Rules of Procedure, which now and again you try to change, get thrown in the wastepaper basket the moment they are

changed. The Rules of Procedure are not our constitution, but every day you treat them as if they were just so much waste paper. And a Parliament that does not observe its own rules would do better not to change them! It is pointless changing rules, if you are not going to abide by them anyway! Mr Patterson was quite right when he said that the problem is with Rule 28: you don't use it but abuse it.

Well, Mr President, where do we go from here? I am not asking your advice so much as wondering whether you are going to let me speak or not. I suspect not. In that case, for us to be able to debate the amendments tomorrow, I am going to have to go through them for you: Amendment No 171, Amendment No 95, Amendment No 98, Amendment No 96, No 97, No 93, No 114, No 99, No 92, No 115, No 116 ...

Mr President, in Italian we have an expression 'dare i numeri'. I don't know how the interpreters will translate that, but it means 'to show signs of madness'. I am seemingly faced with a dilemma: should I 'show signs of madness' or should I deny the House the chance to vote on a series of amendments. So you see, it is not simply a matter of finding a way round the problem of ubiquity — as our British colleague put it, who earlier tried unsuccessfully to express an opinion: these things happen — we also need to solve the problem of what to do to ensure that your plans are respected. I don't know what to do. I ask you therefore, Mr President, to please take these 108 amendments as read, because I am certainly not going to have the time to go through them one by one.

Whether this is to be a parliament or a travesty of one, whether this is to be a parliament or a madhouse, is for you to determine. As far as we are concerned, let me tell you that it is only out of respect for parliamentary right and for Parliament that we continue to speak, to remain silent and to tell you that we shall be voting tomorrow. I don't know if we are going to be allowed to vote for long, but I hope that this at least we will continue to do, in spite of the Lusters, in spite of the presidents — not you, Mr President, that this Parliament has elected and who still represent it.

**President.** — I call Mr D'Angelosante.

**Mr D'Angelosante.** — (*I*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, anyone with any common sense who has the slightest knowledge of what goes on in this Parliament is aware that it operates under extremely difficult conditions which at times become nearly impossible. This is to be expected in a Parliament that has at least as big a programme as any of the national parliaments but very much less time in which to carry it through.

What we have to do then is either extend the hours we work or reduce the workload. We believe that this should be achieved as far as possible by means of

**D'Angelosante**

voluntary curtailment by Members of certain activities, the effect of which has been to carry the election campaigns of many of us over into this House. It would also help if we were to bring about changes in some of the long-established practices that really have no basis in the Rules of Procedure, such as the length of part-sessions and, as recently, if we were to make suitable changes to the Rules or Procedure. This latter step must, we feel, be tackled with the greatest possible circumspection and in the full awareness that we are not talking here about cutting off dead wood but about rights and privileges that are the very essence of parliamentary life but which are conceded rather grudgingly by the existing Rules of Procedure.

But they have decided to make a start on matters that to us seem far from secondary, rather than on other less sensitive areas.

Turning now to the proposals themselves, and beginning with Rule 14, we are not at all in favour of limiting urgent procedure to matters that have not previously been through the committees because a matter already discussed in committee but not yet placed on the agenda may nevertheless be urgent. Nor do we think it right, in view of the tightening up of the procedures, to allow urgent procedure to be repeated in respect of matters already dealt with only a short time before, as has happened here in recent months. Furthermore, it is unreasonable to insist that requests for urgency can only be contested in writing as this simply creates further means of obstructing the proceedings. The written statements of those opposing urgency have to be translated and circulated and, if several such statements were submitted, this procedure would effectively block any debate on the matter for which urgency has been requested and at the same time significantly add to Parliament's workload.

Lastly we are opposed to the idea of a special quorum of one-third of the Members being required for urgency to be granted. This device would be exploited by some groups even in cases which, by their very nature, do not warrant imposition of such a quorum. Our amendments to Rule 14 seek to do away with these points.

However, much more serious changes are being proposed to the rule relating to explanations of vote that Members of this Parliament have been allowed hitherto. This right is already very severely curtailed by the fact that it is confined to the final vote and may not exceed three minutes. The present proposal leaves things as they are as regards the spokesmen for the political groups, but other Members may only, in certain circumstances, make a statement after the vote. Moreover, the statement may be given orally only if the President agrees; otherwise, it must be submitted in writing.

We feel this proposal is a gross imposition on Parliament and humiliating for its Members. It is also ridicu-

lous and arrogant. By its very nature the explanation of vote has to come before the vote. It is the only logical place for it. The rapporteur knows this himself but still he is trying unsuccessfully to circumscribe and define the purpose of these explanations of vote by quoting examples not worth imitating. We need only look at the parliamentary tradition of most of our countries to find our model. Indeed, in my country any statement after the vote is prohibited and would be regarded as an inadmissible comment on the vote already expressed. Now, we can see that there may be times when we have to bow to a majority view in favour of a different solution, however irrational. What we cannot accept, however, is that spokesmen for the political groups should be allowed to give a genuine explanation of vote, while others have to be content with a brief, pointless and unheeded statement hours, if not days, after the debate is over. We cannot stand for a situation where, in the same circumstances, the same rights are applied differently or, worse still, entirely different rights are applied to different Members. In allowing Group spokesmen to make an oral statement before the vote, you are in effect conceding that that is the explanation of vote. You cannot therefore allow other Members something else. You can cut down their speaking time but you have to give them the same right! Like other Groups in this Parliament, we are proposing that individual explanations of vote should be kept to one and a half minutes. If this amendment is rejected, we propose that oral explanations of vote lasting one and a half minutes be allowed to Members who disagree with the statement made by their Group spokesman.

Mr President, the amendments we have tabled are realistic amendments. We have not tabled hundreds of them and we have no desire to engage in an endless stubborn battle, because we hope that there is still a majority in favour of decisions that will help Parliament to avoid unnecessary humiliation and loss of prestige.

IN THE CHAIR: MR B. FRIEDRICH

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Galland.

**Mr Galland.** — (*F*) Mr President, we have, thank Heavens, already made some changes to the Rules or Procedure. And, thank Heavens, we have in particular revised the provisions on speaking time. This has been effective, because when I have an opportunity, and this is a regular occurrence, of hearing Mr Pannella expressing his views in our midst, I consider it fortunate that we have limited the excesses. In the hit parade of those who speak most in the European Parliament



## Galland

Mr Pannella is certainly No 1. But when it comes to the substance and the essence of the matter in hand, he is fortunately under control, so to speak. Hence the interest in modifying the Rules of Procedure. I should also like to say that — and in this we perhaps stand alone in this Parliament — we are quite satisfied with our speaking time. I do not need to speak more quickly to explain myself. Mr Nord has spoken, Mr Rey this morning explained the position of the Liberal and Democratic Group on the Council's programme and, since we get ourselves organized, we are perfectly happy with Rule 28 (2), knowing that we are clearly at a disadvantage compared with the minority groups.

We should, however, like to draw Members' attention to various points, and I have three preliminary comments to make. Firstly, how should we reform the Rules of Procedure? There are two tendencies in our Parliament: those whom I would call the lightning artists, and the wait-and-see purists. And we cannot escape the lightning artists or the wait-and-see purists. The former say we must modify the Rules of Procedure all the time by the urgency procedure, this being necessary for the proper organization of our work. It is also true to say, when we consider what is happening to Mr Nord's report or to Mr Luster's report, that they are not altogether wrong. It is the only time we make any real progress. The wait-and-see purists, on the other hand, say: Let us wait until the whole of the Rules or Procedure is modified, because when we have revised the whole thing, with the rules slotting together one with the other, we shall have done a good job. But, as the wait-and-see purists well know, we shall still be at it in four years' time. So once again in this Parliament — and I believe this is not the first time that the Liberal and Democratic Group has drawn the attention of Parliament and the members of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to a number of effective methods — we propose that we should systematically proceed to reform the Rules of Procedure every year, during the budgetary part-session in November. This will allow us to undertake the revision of the Rules of Procedure as a whole, starting with Rule 1 and finishing with Rule 54. And then, at each November part-session, what is ready will be discussed and voted on. We shall have deadlines each time and make real progress in our work. If these deliberations coincide with the budgetary part-session, we shall be sure of the quorum that is needed for both the Rules of Procedure and the budgetary part-sessions. We believe that this will be an efficient way of doing things.

As regards the spirit of these revisions of the Rules of Procedure, again the Liberal and Democratic Group of course takes up the defence of the minorities, as it did at the time of the recent amendment of the Rules proposed by the Nord report. And in the amendments we have tabled this time, here again we take up the defence of the minorities. I feel that the report by Mr Luster — whom Mr Nord rightly thanked, because it is truly an ungrateful task being the rapporteur on the

Rules of Procedure — must allow us to work in this spirit if we table reasonable amendments. I would merely point out that, if we followed Mr Pannella's advice on the amendments, ladies and gentlemen, we should need more than two days simply to defend the amendments to the Luster report as he wishes. More than two days to defend the amendments to the Luster report: I wonder when we would discuss the other subjects which are so dear to his heart and which seem to me so very much more important.

We have now reached the stage where I should like to put forward the ideas the Liberal and Democratic Group has on Rule 26. Once again, the way we went about our work in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions was far from satisfactory. Not because we drew up a report in a rush, but because we systematically work in a disastrous fashion in that committee. We need only consider the number of amendments that have been tabled to the Luster report by all the political groups to realize that our work was of a poor standard. But we agree, this is what is surprising, that we could have worked better. Let us admit our guilt, Mrs Vayssade, Mr Patterson, Mr Luster, Mr Nord and myself, because as I see it — amendment No 19 by Mr Patterson, amendment No 14 by Mr D'Angelosante, amendment No 151 by Mrs Bonino, amendment No 60 by Mr Galland and Mr Nord — we are all agreed. I am not referring to the EPP Group, but we are all agreed, and that represented a large majority. To put it extremely simply: let us limit individual Member's explanations of vote to one and a half minutes and let us have them before the vote. So if we were all agreed — and our amendments show we were — I ask myself why we have this report. We worked badly. So we have two alternatives, and of course, whether we take amendment No 19, No 151 or No 60, we defend the right of every Member of Parliament to give an explanation of vote before the vote. That seems elementary to us. We took a long time trying to explain this in the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. Once again, the votes tomorrow will show we were right. We are sorry we were not heard early enough to avoid this waste of time.

We are now faced with a problem: the possibility that the President may deny individual explanations of vote. Firstly, the Sieglerschmidt solution, amendment No 46: remove the possibility open to the President of not allowing an oral explanation of vote. This is an extreme solution: we are not opposed to it. The Liberal and Democratic Group has not yet expressed its views regarding this suggestion. But it is necessary to be rigorous with Rules of Procedure. Second solution: amendment No 61 by Mr Galland and Mr Nord, which is a sub-amendment to the Patterson amendment: Where the President deems it absolutely necessary in the light of the progress of Parliament's work — and this is more rigorous than what you are saying, my friend — on rare occasions, therefore, he may deny the right to give an oral explanation of vote.

**Galland**

We therefore have a simple choice, and a parliamentary assembly is normally elected to make choices, between two ways of applying a principle on which we are all, with few exceptions, agreed. I would then say that it would also be sensible to suppress any definition of the explanation of vote in this rule. Mr Luster, we come from different countries and do not therefore, as you well know, agree on a definition of the explanation of vote. To Mr D'Angelosante I would say that I was surprised by his closing remark, and I too will close with this remark: Mr D'Angelosante, the right of the individual Member of Parliament to give an explanation of vote may mean his doing so even when he agrees with his group, because he finds it necessary to explain his position. I am therefore very surprised to find you apparently saying in one of your amendments that a Member should be permitted to give an explanation of vote only when he disagrees with his group. The principle of the right of the individual Member to give an oral explanation of vote before the vote is taken is absolute, and if the amendments to which I referred just now are not adopted, the Liberal and Democratic Group will not vote on the Luster report, for which there will not then be a quorum. We have been saying the same thing for two months, ladies and gentlemen. The least we deserve is consistency.

**President.** — I call Mr Coppieters.

**Mr Coppieters.** — (NL) Mr President, in a recent statement Mr Klepsch claimed that Europe was progressing towards genuine democracy, and, he even added, towards a Europe of free and emancipated citizens. I would cast serious doubts on the correctness of this statement after a year of incessant changes to the Rules of Procedure in this Parliament, with which Mr Luster's name has unfortunately been associated more than once. We are now discussing Rules 14 and 26, in other words the urgency procedure and the explanation of vote, the most suitable means we have of expressing our views and making our contributions. But the Luster report sets out from a completely wrong train of thought. It is not based on the will of Parliament but of a certain majority group in the Bureau, whom I would without further ado accuse of lust for power. Such groups are always annoyed about minorities that do not toe the line. As they have not been able to eliminate the small political groups or bring them to their knees, they try to reduce us to silence with repeated changes to the Rules of Procedure, which are not aimed at improving the conduct of business in Parliament. I protest against this, because that is the essence of the matter. I do not have the time to go into detail, even though I too have tabled amendments.

Let me give an example of the danger that lurks in this change in the Rules of Procedure: those who have the courage to table amendments suffer because in the general allocation of speaking time they are not

allowed any additional time to explain their amendments. The same majority that is responsible for the revision of Rules 14 and 26, is now endeavouring to use the general allocation of speaking time to make it impossible for amendments to be moved. And the only chance we still had of convincing perhaps just one Member that we are right, namely the explanation of vote before the voting, is consequently threatened with revision. The whole affair has to do with lust for power and nothing to do with the satisfactory conduct of business in Parliament. I therefore hope that you will all be wise enough to support the amendment tabled by Mr Clwyd, Mr Boyes and Mr Seal, so that the minorities are not killed stone-dead.

**President** — I call Mr Tyrrell.

**Mr Tyrrell.** — Mr President, I have listened to this debate with the same despair with which I sat through very many hours and countless meetings of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions since direct elections last July. The inability of this Parliament to conduct its own affairs in a sensible manner is one of the most frustrating experiences that can befall one of the first directly elected Members. What so many of my colleagues in this House have not appreciated is that we have 35 hours a month to debate a wide range of subjects in the House, those 35 being concentrated into one week. The question that we are considering is how those 35 hours can best be used. This problem will remain with us — I agree with Mrs Dekker about this — until we have our own building in our own place so that Parliament can meet more than one week a month when it is necessary to do so and at more flexible hours.

Meanwhile, two areas have been mentioned where it may be possible to economize time. One of them is the time spent discussing whether matters are urgent or not, and the other is the explanation of vote. Now, Mr Chambeiron — he also has left, I see — time spent discussing matters that are urgent is not wasted. Not a moment of it is wasted. What is wasted is the time spent discussing whether they are urgent or not. This is what the proposed amendments are aiming to reduce. Now the precise way in which that end is achieved is of less importance than achieving it, provided, as Mr Gallagher has said, minority rights are protected. Similarly, on the explanation of vote, one has an elaborate allocation under Rule 28 of time between groups so that the time of the Parliament can be carefully rationed and allocated between the matters that demand it, yet we find that a mass of explanations of votes completely wreck the timetable. Now, again we are at one in seeking to deal with that issue. The only question is how.

We in the European Democratic Group do not like some of the proposals either in the report thrashed out by Mr Luster in committee after many hours of very

**Tyrrell**

painful debate. We do not like some of the points in Mr Nord's amendment on Rule 14. We certainly do not like some of the proposals on Rule 26, but we in our group are willing to support amendments, even though we do not like them, provided they achieve the end which we have suggested.

So I urge my friends Mr Galland and Mr Adonnino of the Christian Democrats — I see he too has left the chamber at this crucial period in the debate — to come together and see if they can find whether one or other of these amendments will suit them. They each want to save Parliament's time that is being spent unnecessarily and they each want to defend minority rights. I do urge them before tomorrow to come together and find common ground. I can say this on behalf of my group: although we do not like a number of the proposals being put forward, we will support those amendments which achieve these purposes, provided they have majority support. The rapporteur is sitting there and I know he will use his good offices to this end, knowing that he can count on our support. If this Parliament is going to be credible, it must have sensible Rules of Procedure. It can only have sensible Rules of Procedure if we approach the problems in a spirit of compromise. Remember that we are going to need 206 Members to vote for these amendments if they are to be adopted. This is a time for constructive thinking, good will and co-operation. I urge the House to vote accordingly.

**President.** — I call Mrs Hammerich.

**Mrs Hammerich.** — (DK) Mr President, we see a particularly political aspect to Mr Luster's proposals. We are thinking especially of the new rules on explanations of vote. In future only one representative of each group would be allowed an explanation of vote before voting took place. The others, if the powers that be permit, would be allowed 90 seconds after the fall of the curtain and without any audience. Only one from each group. That would substantially strengthen the position of the supranational political groups with their pecking orders and hierarchies, and correspondingly weaken those who do not share the groups' majority views and weaken national minorities within them. In the past explanations of vote gave these minorities a chance to speak. The proposal will make it hard for Members from our small country to put their views, and even harder if they are against or doubtful about any extension of the Community's powers. It will be difficult for all of them to retain their links with their voters who, with all due respect, Mr President, do constitute a nation. We do not wish to see our countrymen in the large groups forced to conform to majority opinion there. That we see as the political aspect. We shall therefore vote against the proposal as a whole and abstain on the amendments.

**President.** — I call Mr Capanna.

**Mr Capanna.** — (I) Mr President, it is wrong to imagine that the proposed changes in the Rules of Procedure are going to help Parliament to conduct its business more smoothly. These changes clearly have a direct link with the changes already introduced by Parliament. If we look at them as a whole, as we have to in practice, we can see immediately that this idiotic policy with regard to the Rules of Procedure has a very specific object in view, namely to reduce the areas of dissent within Parliament. And I mean dissent not only among the minority groups but also within the majority groups, whether of the right, centre-right or even, occasionally, the left. To any unbiased observer it is clear that this is the thrust of Mr Nord's report yesterday and Mr Luster's report today.

Why this obsession, Mr President? Why is this objective being pursued with such single-mindedness? A fundamental reason is beginning to emerge more and more clearly — and I am not indulging in flights of political fancy: this is not so much a Parliament as a heterodirect assembly, let us be quite blunt about it. By that I mean that we are being asked to take decisions most of which — and above all those with broad political implications — are in fact being taken outside this House, above all in Paris and Bonn but sometimes elsewhere too. Mr President, we cannot close our eyes to the fact — indeed it would be wrong to do so — that this Parliament was not informed about a political event that took place only a few days ago and which is nothing short of a major scandal. The Political Affairs Committee decided not to follow up two resolutions — in connection with which Parliament considered but rejected requests for urgency — one on the deployment of the deadly new American missiles in Europe and the other about the genocide of American Indians by the United States Federal Government, which may seem a matter of little importance but is in fact of very real significance. The Political Affairs Committee did not consider either of these two matters worth reporting on. The Political Affairs Committee, chaired by the ineffable Mr Rumor, decided, in other words, not to discuss them.

Mr President, if you put all these apparently separate yet logically connected elements together, it becomes perfectly clear that these measures are measures against democracy, calculated to destroy freedom. I am very curious to see whether Mr Galland will stand by his proposal, because then I believe Mr Luster will realize that there is still a few hours' time during which these clearly liberticidal measures — I repeat this for the benefit of the majority groups and thus also for the 270 million Europeans we are supposed to represent here — can be stopped, thwarted by our Parliament's desire for wisdom and democracy.

**President.** — I call Mr Spicer.

**Mr Spicer.** — Mr President, I have been a Member of this Parliament before it was directly elected, when we were nominated, and I have had the great fortune to become a Member of a directly-elected Parliament. And I must say to those Members who are in this House that if we proceed upon the course upon which some Members in particular now seem to be embarked, then all that has been built up in the past 20 years in this Parliament will be destroyed. I have been horrified to sit here and hear people say — at this crucial moment, when at long last we are beginning to think about getting some order into our affairs — that they are prepared to turn aside from that, led by, if I may so, the honeyed but deathly words of people who really want us to spend our time talking, if I may quote what was said just a minute ago, about the genocide of Americal Indians.

What are we about? We are about the European Community, and our first duty is to deal with the business of that Community. Everything else is secondary; if we have time to do it afterwards, then by all means let us do it. Mr President, you know how true this is, as do many of the people who serve this Parliament and have served it over many years. However, if we go on as we are, if we waste hours and hours of those precious 35 hours on fruitless discussion, then not only will people within the Community take no notice of us, but we will increasingly become a figure of fun for the media within the Community, and that would be destructive.

I do beg those people who have spoken in terms of not giving their support tomorrow to think again. Tomorrow is a crucial day for this Parliament, and if we do not achieve the right result tomorrow, we come back in September as we were last July and last September, October, November, December. I have never felt so strongly about anything in my life and I will come back in September with a heavy heart if this matter has not reached a conclusion then.

**President.** — I call Mr Luster.

**Mr Luster, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, I should like to thank most sincerely all those who have made the effort to view objectively the report which I have drawn up on behalf of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. I was flattered to hear Mr Nord's and Mr Galland's fairly accurate description of the rapporteur's role in this committee. It is indeed true to say that none of us faces an easy task. I most definitely reject the insinuation evident from some speeches that the sole objective of this whole affair is to prevent minorities from exercising their rights.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we have, as it were, for each part-session a cake to eat. We must try to share this one cake out fairly, ensuring that all the groups, the smaller ones and the larger ones, get their

due. Anyone who tries to eat the cake twice is being foolish, and is asking us to do something absurd. I have a great deal of sympathy for the minorities in the House, for those who belong to the smaller groups and for the non-attached Members when they say they are not happy with this arrangement, because they want more speaking time than they are allotted, although they simply cannot be allotted any more. I was therefore really rather disappointed that we have not been presented with new ideas on how to get out of this vicious circle of limited time, ideas that we might have considered. But at the moment we have the problem of limited time, and this is the only way we could think of solving it.

I am, of course, willing to view all reasonable amendments with an open mind, as I shall demonstrate tomorrow when the President asks me during the voting what my position is on the various amendments. But the approach we adopt tomorrow should, I feel, be that implied by Mr Tyrrell when he said that we must tackle the problems in a spirit of compromise. So distinguished a Member as Mr Galland told us at the beginning of his speech that the purists are bad people and finished by saying: 'And I, Galland, have tabled amendments with my friend Nord. If you adopt them, everything will be fine. If you reject them, we shall vote against everything, and then you will not have a quorum.'

I believe, Mr Galland, that I am prepared to think about what has been said in the report. I would ask you to think seriously about this sentence of your speech in terms of whether it should be so categorical.

I promised to speak for two minutes. My thanks for all the cooperation in committee. It was a hard job, I would say, and despite everything I hope that tomorrow, in the spirit of compromise to which Mr Tyrrell referred, we will find a satisfactory solution for this Parliament. Rome was not built in a day. Anyone who tries something similar is doomed to failure from the outset. Let us do what we can tomorrow.

(Applause)

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

## 12. Urgent procedure

**President.** — I have received two motions for resolutions with request for urgent debate, pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

— from Mr Seal and others on the neutron bomb (Doc. 1-307/80);

**President**

— from Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg and others on the outcome of the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea (Doc. 1-308/80).

The reasons supporting these requests are contained in the documents themselves.

I shall consult Parliament on the urgency of these motions for resolutions at the beginning of the sitting.

**13. Question Time**

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the second part of Question Time (Doc. 1-287/80).

We shall begin with the questions to the Council.

Question No 43 by Mr Adam (H-183/80):

What is the reaction of the Council to the proposals for a new Community energy initiative issued by CEPCEO (the Community Coal Producers' Organization) on 24 March 1980 and how far are the views expressed by CEPCEO acceptable to the Council and how soon can positive measures to implement the proposals be expected?

**Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council** — (F) The Council has not yet been informed of the proposals for a new Community energy initiative issued by the Community Coal Producers' Organization to which the honourable Member refers. In any case, it is more for the Commission to assess the extent to which such ideas might be taken into account when it is drawing up the proposals it intends submitting to the Council. I would add in this context that I expressed my personal views on this subject during the general debate earlier today.

**Mr Adam.** — I am surprised that the details of the proposals put forward by the coal industry in the Community are not known to Members of the Council, but could I ask specifically what attitude the Council is going to take on the question of pit closures, because one of the things that was said in the latest meeting of Energy Ministers was that they were going to increase the amount of coal that is produced in the Community? That depends on having pits available to produce that coal, and in the last five years 52 pits in the Community have closed. As I see it, it is necessary to keep our pits operating, unless they have completely run out of reserves, so that the capacity to produce more coal is there. I would therefore ask the President of the Council if he could confirm that the Energy Council does intend to look at this problem and I specifically repeat the question that I had in my original submission, namely, when can we expect measures from the Council to implement the proposals

that come from the Commission and also to follow up on the recent Energy Council meeting?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) As regards the proposals to which the honourable Member refers, I would point out to the Assembly that the proposals put forward by CEPCEO, as this organization is known, are in fact confined to a press release dated 24 March 1980, and this is the only way in which they have been brought to our notice. They were not addressed to us directly.

I had an opportunity of expressing my views on the substance of the question this morning. I said that the Community is perhaps more sensitive to the energy problem now that the two summits — the Community summit and the summit meeting of the industrialized countries — have decided that resolute steps must be taken in an attempt to reduce dependence on oil supplies, to increase the range, to find alternative sources of energy and to make increasing use — something that was criticized by certain Members only this morning — of coal and nuclear power.

As regards the economic and social problem which the honourable Member mentioned, it is difficult to give a general answer. You will agree with me that the trend in oil prices — and we saw some years ago what many did not envisage happening — that the prices of all sources of energy are rising and levelling off at the price of oil, and that this general rise in prices has resulted in certain coal mines which had ceased to be profitable in economic terms, now becoming profitable again.

When it comes to aids at Community level, it must be remembered that the Coal and Steel Treaty, or the Treaty of Paris, provides for social aids, but so far economic subsidies as such have always been refused by the Community. Proposals are being discussed by the Council, but agreement has not yet been reached. The Council has not been able to decide on the proposals that have been submitted to it. As you will appreciate, it is very dangerous for a President-in-Office who has just taken up his post to make forecasts about the date on which, in a matter as complex as this, a final decision is likely to be taken. I can only hope that this will be done as soon as possible, and this optimism stems from the fact that the Heads of State or Government have insisted on urgent action in the establishment of a policy in this area.

**Mr Griffiths.** — To a very limited extent the President of the Council has answered my question, but I would like a more positive assurance that the Council is prepared to ask the Commission to draw up proposals for economic support to coal mines which at the present time may not be able to make a profit, but whose loss, if they were closed, would have a severely damaging effect on the future possibilities for coal production in the Community. He mentioned himself

**Griffiths**

that some mines which previously were not economic have become so because of changing circumstances. I would like a positive assurance that the Council will set about pursuing such a policy to save mines which might not be economic now, but could well become so as oil prices go even higher.

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) As President-in-Office of the Council, I can only reply on what is being done. I fully appreciate that, in so saying, I may be disappointing Members. But if certain Members ask me to give the answer they consider most favourable to their theories, we shall have difficulty in understanding each other. I am explaining the situation as it is. To put it more precisely, I must ask the honourable Member to bear in mind that — whether he likes it or not — the absence of agreement in the Council on the course he seems to be outlining, is due to the fact that there are Member States which are not willing at this time to subsidize certain energy products from which they do not derive any benefit. It is regrettable, but that is the way it is, and that is why unanimity has not been achieved at this level. That is why I cannot even imagine it being achieved today. The Community's newspapers are full of this debate, the governments have differing opinions and the President of the Council cannot say we must adopt this or that course. He can simply tell you that there is disagreement on this issue and that, as I see it, knowing the situation in this matter, we should not expect — unfortunately, you will say — agreement to be reached in this area in the short term.

Secondly, the Commission has made proposals but, as I have told you, they have not reached the final stage of discussion in the Council and they have not been approved.

Thirdly, you ask me if the Council intends to call for new proposals. But it is not for the Council to call for proposals: it is for the Commission — and it has done so — to put forward new proposals if it considers this worthwhile, and the Council will then act. But do not expect the Council — especially along the lines you have described, where we are a long way from unanimity — unanimously to call on the Commission for these proposals. That will not happen so soon.

**Mrs Ewing** — Could I thank the President for what I think was a very frank answer and could I ask him if he is aware that the Commission cannot even give estimates of optimum tonnage from Scottish pits, which I put at 12 million tonnes a year, but for which the Commission refuses to give any figure? Is it good enough for the Council to sit and talk about profitability — which is after all the President's own word — when we all know perfectly well that the test of profitability is a very different standard indeed in the nuclear industry and in the coal industry. Could we not ask the President in the coming six months to look

at this and perhaps sit a bit hard on the Commission, because unless we have an overall set of forecasting statistics, how can we possibly advance towards any kind of common energy policy?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) Madam, I fully appreciate your reaction this evening, as I appreciated it this afternoon, since I believe I understand the thought underlying your question. But allow me to draw your attention to something I said earlier: I said that unfortunately — and this is what you are criticizing — we are still very far from having an integrated energy policy.

At the moment, as you know, energy policy is, on the one hand, in the hands of the various Member States and, on the other, very much a sectoral matter. At this stage, things being as they are, the Commission itself will certainly be very careful with the figures it puts forward. You have just proved this with the example you have given. At this stage, the Commission, as I know it, will do no more than put forward what the various national governments regard as the optimal figures, the figures with which it is provided. It is not a case of when we have taken the step of establishing an integrated policy on energy resources and supplies, you will have *sui generis* concepts and *ad hoc* solutions proposed by the Community. We have not yet reached that stage, unfortunately. Rest assured, Madam, that you are not alone in regretting that this is not so.

**Mr Moreland.** — As the President of the Council will know, the Commission has put forward proposals in recent years to restrain the growth in imports of coal into the Community, while accepting that the Community must import some coal. Does the Council accept this as a principle of policy and indeed does it accept that really the time has come when we must look to restrain the growth in imports of coal from countries such as Poland and South Africa?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) I am afraid there is some misunderstanding. The Commission has not, has never proposed that imports of coal should be limited or stopped. The situation here is the same as in other areas: we are told, on the one hand, that we have too much meat and asked, on the other, to import meat from New Zealand. The Commission's policy has never been to close the market and to prohibit imports. What it has asked for is that the subsidies granted to imported coal remain below those we grant to coal produced in the Community. These proposals have, moreover, not yet been unanimously approved by the Council. This is a statement of fact, not a personal view of my own.

**President.** — Question No 44 by Sir John Stewart-Clark (H-223/80):

**President**

Would the Council accept that directive 77/489/EEC<sup>1</sup> on the protection of animals during international transport needs clarification to ensure firstly that responsibility during transport is defined and that those countries exporting particularly horses to the Community are subject to the conditions of the directive?

**Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (F) Article 7 of Directive 77/489/EEC on the protection of animals during international transport provides for the adoption of the measures required for its implementation. The Commission forwarded a proposal for a directive to this effect to the Council on 23 January 1979. The proposed measures provide, among other things, for better supervision of animals during international transport, specifically by means of detailed certification covering each part of the journey. Following the opinion delivered by the Assembly on 11 May 1979, the Council is considering the proposal, and a decision should be taken in this matter at the earliest opportunity.

**Sir John Stewart-Clark.** — I would like to thank the President-in-Office of the Council for those very reassuring words and hope that we will be getting a full report shortly. I am sure you will understand that I have particular concern about the matter of shipment of horses from Iron Curtain countries.

Can the Council inform us which authorities are, or should be, responsible for the animals at the initial shipment stage, the separate trans-shipment stage and on delivery? And can the Council say whether adequate veterinary services are available at each of these stages to ensure proper inspection and veterinary attention?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) I hope that the honourable Member will not take it amiss if the poor President-in-Office of the Council admits, quite frankly, that he is far from being a specialist in this field and that the only information he can give him today is of a very recent date. I am told that the Commission's proposals, already provide for a health certificate — issued after an inspection by the official veterinary officer of the exporting country — to accompany the animals, for a second certificate showing that intermediate checks have been made to ensure the standards laid down in the directive have been observed, and for the inspection by the veterinary officer of the importing country certifying that the animals are in a good state of health after being transported to suffice as an assurance that the standards specified by the directive have been observed. Nevertheless, the Council's group of veterinary experts are continuing their technical work to provide for more detailed certification, as proposed by the Commission. And I believe that in this respect there may be a difference of opinion between the honourable Member and the view expressed by Parliament, which differs slightly from his opinion.

**Mr Howell.** — I would like to draw the President-in-Office's attention to the great problem and public concern concerning importation of horses from Greece into Italy. And I would be grateful if he would inform this House of what the situation is at present and if he would assure the House that in the negotiations for Greece's entry—prior to Greece's entry—into the Community he will look into this situation, since tremendous public anxiety is caused by this problem, especially in the light of recent reports that horses in Greece are being maimed on purpose to enable them to be transported live for slaughter into Italy.

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) My officials advise me that a similar question was asked when my predecessor, Mr Colombo, was President-in-Office. He gave much the same answer as I shall now give.

You realize, Mr Howell, that when Greece accedes to the Community as from 1 January 1981, it will submit itself to all Community laws, directives and decisions. By this date therefore at the very latest order will have been restored in the area that you have very rightly mentioned, because we shall then have legal means of carrying out checks and exerting pressure in this matter. As to whether anything can be done between now and then to improve the situation, I can only say that I shall do all I can, but please do not ask me to promise anything more than that.

**President.** — Question No 45 by Mr Seal (H-148/80):

What amendments would have to be made to the Treaty of Rome in order for a national Parliament to enact legislation to restore powers to decide whether Community legislation should be applicable to itself?

**Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (F) According to the provisions of Article 236 of the Treaty of Rome it is for the government of any Member State or for the Commission to submit to the Council proposals for the amendment of the Treaty. On receiving a proposal of this kind, it would be for the Council, after consulting the Assembly and, where appropriate, the Commission, to decide whether to deliver a favourable opinion at a conference of representatives of the governments of the Member States. Where the Council delivers a favourable opinion, this conference is convened by the President of the Council for the purpose of determining by common accord the amendments to be made to the Treaty. The amendments then enter into force after being ratified by all the Member States in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements.

As the Council has not received a proposal for an amendment with the objective alluded to by the honourable Member, the Council has not been called upon to decide whether such a proposal would merit

<sup>1</sup> OJ L 200 of 8. 8. 1977, p. 10

**Thorn**

the convening of a conference. It is not for the Council, at any stage of the procedure set out in Article 236, to decide what amendments are needed to achieve this or that objective.

Allow me to add, Sir, my personal view that, in the Community as it is and which has my full approval, such an idea seems inconceivable to me.

**Mr Seal.** — The reason I ask this question, Mr President, is that many people in the British Labour Party feel that enacting this kind of legislation for the UK parliament is the absolute minimum that will happen when the Labour Party takes control, as it surely will, in the UK.

*(Laughter)*

Could the President-in-Office of the Council therefore tell us — his explanation did seem rather long and complicated and I shall have to study it when I get the written document — what action he would recommend the Council to take against any Member State that actually enacted legislation for its own parliament without going through this long rigmarole?

**Mr Thorn.** — *(F)* The problem to which the honourable Member refers was discussed before Britain's accession and at the time of the negotiations after Britain's entry, the 'renegotiations' requested by the United Kingdom. It is therefore a question with which I am quite familiar. You know the answer we gave. And my explanations — which the honourable Member found so long — merely referred to the procedure for amending the Treaties.

I could have given a more laconic answer and said that, the Community being what it is and the Treaty being what it is, such proposals are inconceivable. This is what I said at the end of my answer.

Let me say now, in the clearest possible terms, that I have the greatest reservations about the very idea of amending the Treaty so as to allow Member States themselves to decide if Community legislation is applicable to them or not. If we do that, we shall really have an à la carte Europe in every respect. It is obvious, ladies and gentlemen, that such a course would radically change the foundations on which the Community is built and might even endanger its survival. I am also sure that the honourable Member is very well aware of this.

To illustrate this observation, I shall simply quote a passage from the judgment of the Court of Justice of 15 July 1964 in the *Costa* case:

The law stemming from the Treaty, an independent source of law, could not because of its special and original nature, be overridden by domestic legal provisions, however, framed, without being deprived of its

character as Community law and without the legal basis of the Community itself being called into question. The transfer by the States from their domestic legal system to the Community legal system of the rights and obligations arising under the Treaty carries with it a permanent limitation of their sovereign rights, precedence over which limitation may not be accorded to a unilateral and subsequent measure inconsistent with the notion of the Community.

In other words, if we were to do what you want us to do — and I understand your political concern, even if I have no sympathy with it — the Treaty would have to be amended. That is all.

**Mr Welsh.** — Mr President-in-Office, with great respect, since this is the first time that you have taken questions, could I perhaps explain that Mr Seal asks this question every Question Time. He gets the same answer every time, but regrettably the Right Honourable Gentleman shares certain characteristics with certain French kings in that he has forgotten nothing and learnt nothing.

*(Laughter)*

Does the President-in-Office understand that the present British Government is totally committed to Britain's membership of the Community and its attitude is most unlikely to ever change?

*(Applause from the European Democratic Group)*

**Mr Thorn.** — *(F)* Those are political considerations that the honourable Member would not want me to pursue. I understand the position of the Labour Party, and I understand the position of the British Conservative Party now in power.

**Mr Megahy.** — Could I ask the President-in-Office first of all if he would agree that the 1972 Act which took the United Kingdom into the Community laid down quite explicitly that that Act could be amended by any British Government, and secondly that it is in fact the policy of the major opposition party in the United Kingdom to review that Act? Leaving aside all considerations as to what the result of the next election might be, could I put a hypothetical question as to what would happen if a future British Government did, in fact, decide to exercise the sovereign powers it undoubtedly has to amend the '72 Act, and lastly could I ask whether, in the light of the recent experience where the French Government has shown quite successfully that no effective sanctions can be taken against governments which do in fact break the treaties, he would not agree that, in such an eventuality, the EEC itself could take no effective sanctions against a government which chose to exercise such powers?



**Mr Thorn.** — (F) As regards the first point, I am unfortunately unable to agree with the honourable Member in any way when he speaks of the right of the Member State that has joined us, the United Kingdom, to amend acts or the Treaties. I negotiated Britain's accession and I myself signed the Treaty of Accession on behalf of the Council of the Community along with the then British Prime Minister. In the Treaty which I signed there is no mention of this right. If you have been told differently by a member of the British Government, that is an internal question you will have to clarify with him. But the Treaty, negotiated and duly signed, makes no mention of the provisions to which you refer.

In addition, you speak of those who have allegedly, according to what you say, violated the Treaty. This is not the place and Question Time is not the time for us to judge these cases or matters as political as these.

But you add a final question. You ask us if we have the means to apply sanctions. We said this morning and we have said throughout the day that we have many things in common, including our conception not only of human rights but also of democracy, parliamentary rules and justice. Something else we all have in common, I feel, is that we keep our word, we respect treaties that have been duly signed. Forgive us, if in the treaties we conclude amongst ourselves we do not always make provision for all the sanctions which apparently need to be applied against those who violate the Treaties and acts, because we proceed from the idea of *pacta sunt servanda* and that those who sign treaties intend to respect them. This is a basic element of international law.

*(Applause from various quarters on the right)*

**Mr van Aerssen.** — (D) Let us suppose for the sake of argument, Mr Thorn, that a Member State takes the action depicted by Mr Megahy in his question and breaks the law of the Treaty. Does the President-in-Office of the Council agree that the European Parliament, acting by a majority decision, might call on the Commission to initiate proceedings against that Member State in the Court of Justice to bring the situation back into line with the Treaty?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) As the guardian of the Treaties, the Commission must, even if Parliament does not request it to do so, ensure that the Treaties are respected. It must take the necessary action to this end. As for Parliament, it does not need to be taught any lessons, least of all by the President-in-Office of the Council.

**President.** — Question No 46 by Mrs Ewing (H-167/80):

In view of the Opinion of Parliament<sup>1</sup> that industrial restructuring problems, which are particularly acute in

Scotland, should be referred for long-term analysis to a forecasting unit (such as the European Institute for Economic and Social Policy Research), what progress has the Council made in negotiations to set up this body; and will the Council establish it in central Scotland, as Scotland and Denmark are the only Community countries without any Community institution on their soil?

**Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (F) The Council has unfortunately been unable thus far to reach agreement on the Commission's proposal for the creation of a European Institute for Economic and Social Policy Research, a proposal which, moreover, was made in the report drawn up by my Prime Minister. I am sorry, Madam, that I cannot give you any accurate information on this, and I must say that I have a great deal of sympathy for you, because the issue in this case seems to me to be the location. I hope that a solution which meets with your approval will be found in the near future.

**Mrs Ewing.** — May I draw the attention of the President-in-Office to the sad history of the institute that was approved by this House in 1976 and has never come into existence, even under a different name. It was originally christened the Institute of Economic Analysis and Research after the Council turned it down, it and Social Policy Research was renamed the Institute for Economic but apparently the Council is still turning it down. In drawing the attention of the President-in-Office and of any other interested Member to this matter may I suggest that with our failure to forecast our requirements in every area of industrial restructuring, which is so lamentably obvious at Question Time and during debates, it is time that the Council changed its mind. The Commission is not at fault here, it is the Council of Ministers which is at fault, and may I suggest that when you do reverse your decision, you consider the home of Adam Smith as a very suitable country for it to be established in?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) I regret that I can add little to what I have already said. This is a regrettable situation, but let us not forget that there are institutes of this kind in most of our countries, and this may explain the lack of willingness of the various Member States to decide to set up a new institute at European level. I can do no more than say to the honourable Member once again that personally I of course view her request with the greatest sympathy, but I do not believe that I can be of very much help in this matter in the short term.

**Miss Quin.** — I am rather surprised that in his answer the President-in-Office of the Council did not point out that Scotland is not a country in the same sense that Denmark is, Denmark being a Member State while Scotland is not. As someone who comes from a region that has a higher level of unemployment than Scotland...

**Mrs Ewing.** — It is not a region!

**Miss Quin.** — ... Scotland is a region of the EEC ... where industrial restructuring is also causing very considerable problems, may I ask the President-in-Office whether he would not agree that the site of this body is much less important than the work that it actually might carry out?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) We must distinguish between two questions. The Member States must first agree on the need to create a European institute of this kind. Only then does the question of its location arise. Personally I do not think whether a given area is a district, a region or a country is relevant. The problem as such is not at this stage the location. The question at the moment is to know whether we are going to set up a European institute in addition to those which already exist. I cannot, Madam, prejudice the discussions which will be taking place in the Council on the merits of one city as opposed to another.

**President.** — Question No 47 by Mr Remilly (H-179/80):

In view of the fact that the OPEC countries have decided to adopt the principle of a quarterly adjustment of oil prices, does the Council intend to start negotiations in order to fix these prices on the basis of a jointly agreed and therefore reliable index?

**Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (F) At its last meeting in Venice, the European Council deplored the latest increases in oil prices, which we do not consider justified by the state of the market. Nevertheless, the principle of a dialogue with the oil-producing countries has been referred to on several occasions by the European Council and by the Council of Ministers. The principle of a dialogue of this kind remains established at this stage, and we are aware of quite a number of difficulties in getting it going properly. However, I would add that so far the Council has not been able to put this principle to practical use. I would also add, to avoid any misunderstanding, that we should not forget that no agreement, certainly no unanimous agreement, has been reached in the Council on the principle of indexing. There would even be hostility to such a principle.

**President.** — Question No 48 by Mr Kavanagh (H-216/80):

Will the Council outline briefly the main issues dealt with successfully at the recent meeting of Education Ministers?

**Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (F) On 27 June, quite recently therefore, the Education Ministers meeting in the Council reached basic agreement on the conclusions drawn by the education

Committee on the progress made with the implementation of the action programme of 9 February 1976. We must admit that it took us some considerable time, from 1976 to 1980, to have this meeting. The proceedings focused principally on the education of migrant workers and their children, on encouraging the teaching of foreign languages, on equal chances for girls in education, on the study of the European Community and Europe in schools and on admitting students from other Member States to further education. The Permanent Representatives Committee was invited to consider the action to be taken on the texts adopted and the budgetary implications of these texts. In addition, the Council of Education Ministers exchanged views on problems connected with the transition of young people from education to working life and in particular on the links between education and work and practical experience.

As regards the question of greater conformity of the various education systems in the Community, the Ministers noted with interest the initiative taken by the French delegation with respect to the drawing up of a guide to the history of European civilization for teaching purposes. I think I am also right in saying that a similar question was put to the Commission yesterday and that the answer given was almost the same. I would add, speaking personally, that the various difficulties we are having in this area and the long delay before the Council of Education Ministers met again have been due to the fact that, as you know, opinions differ as to whether or not this subject falls within the Community's terms of reference.

**Mr Kavanagh.** — The President-in-Office assures me that there is in fact a mistake in the press release dealing with this Council and that the Irish Government was actually represented at the meeting. After four years one would expect that there would be an Irish Government representation at this meeting. I hope there is a mistake in the list of countries present at the meeting.

Could I ask the President-in-Office of the Council if, during his presidency, he will hold another meeting of Ministers and ensure that a delay of four years should never occur again. During the last four years, covering the presidencies of eight of the nine Member States, no meeting has been called. In view of the fact that so many important items are being dealt with, such as these mentioned by the President-in-Office, will he ensure that these very important items will be dealt with much more expeditiously in the future? Hopefully under the Luxembourg presidency, and perhaps under the new Commission, there will be regular meetings of this Council to discuss the important topics being dealt with by the Education Ministers.

**Mr Thorn.** — Firstly, the Irish Minister did attend this meeting, that I must stress. Secondly, does the

**Thorn**

honourable Member not think it is asking rather much of a Council which to date has met at four-yearly intervals to meet at four-monthly intervals? That would perhaps be a rather sudden qualitative or quantitative leap, and I would be exceeding my rights if I told you that I would ensure that the Council of Education Ministers met in the next six months. I am in any case convinced that this will not happen. But I believe the fact you have made your voice heard and said you hope another four years will not elapse will have some effect. Personally I fully agree with you, but I do not believe that half-yearly meetings can be considered a serious proposition.

**Mr Key.** — This question concerns recognition of diplomas. Is the Council aware that in the United Kingdom certain medical doctors who obtain a first certificate outside the Nine are allowed to practise inside the United Kingdom, but that, regardless of the qualifications they subsequently obtain inside the UK, they cannot practise inside the other eight Member States of the Community? Indeed, there is an example of a professor in a medical school who acquired his qualifications outside the Nine and who teaches and trains medical doctors inside the UK. While the doctors he trains are permitted to work in the other eight Member States, he himself cannot.

I would welcome the President's views on this problem.

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) I am aware of similar difficulties which, if my information is correct, do not occur in only one country or do not face the nationals of just one country. We are aware of these difficulties, which are not connected with educational or training criteria, but which stem from the directives either on freedom of movement or on the pursuit of some occupation or another. And knowing of these difficulties, my collaborators remind me that a special committee has been instructed to examine, or to record, if you will, all these difficulties and to try to find an early solution to them.

**Mr Schwencke.** — (D) Can it really be said that not only has this meeting enabled the continuation of the programmes on which a start has already been made, but that there is also a chance that, after this Parliament has intervened twice, new, topical aspects of education policy will at least be tackled, and does the President-in-Office of the Council think that there is a chance we might fully exploit the opportunities offered by the Treaty?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) After the two meetings, in 1976 and 1980, and after the various interventions of this Parliament and other quarters, there is good reason to hope that things will keep going now. But there are always various difficulties of a legal nature among the

Member States or, let us say, between one Member State and the others in agreeing on what falls within the Community's terms of reference. On this point we should perhaps all use all our influence to gain acceptance for the idea of regular meetings and for the mission you would like to see devolving on the national Education Ministers.

**Mr Price.** — I would like to try to establish precisely what has been accomplished at this particular meeting of the Council. Could the President-in-Office confirm that in fact the matters of principle which were agreed at this meeting were decided in principle as far back as 1976, when the Education Committee of officials were required at that time to discuss implementing measures? Secondly, can he confirm that the implementing measures were already agreed from 1976 onwards, and that in fact this meeting has made no further progress on agreeing implementing measures? Thirdly, has there been any agreement concerning implementing measures for the admission of students in other member countries? Finally, if as I rather suspect, no progress has been made regarding implementation, will the President-in-Office give this very high priority and try to accomplish during the term of the Luxembourg presidency some actual, practical progress and not merely a further discussion of principle?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) First, a general remark: we will ensure that, come what may, the Education Committee continues to work with all due haste under our presidency. Secondly, as regards your request for more detailed information — and as I do not want to repeat what I have just read out from the document and particularly as I do not want to bore the Assembly by reading out four pages of typescript — I would draw your attention to the press release issued by the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Communities with specific reference to this meeting of the Council of Education Ministers of 27 June 1980. This is Document 8.278-80, and I shall ask one of my collaborators to ensure that you receive a copy, if you do not already have one.

With regard to the specific question you raised at the end of your statement, asking whether the admission of students from other Member States to further education had been discussed, I have just seen, probably after you, that the press release states: 'The discussion enabled solutions to be found to the final questions still outstanding as regards this last point and the guidelines worked out earlier on in the proceedings to be completed.' If you find that sufficiently clear, I think it answers your question.

**Mr Møller.** — (DK) Mr Thorn, in your reply you stated that there was disagreement in the Council as to the Community's competence in the matter. I am under the impression that one reason for the disagree-

**Møller**

ment was that the Minister of Education from my country was not present on the occasion in question. Had she been there, this disagreement might not have taken place. But I should like to ask the President of the Council whether he believes that education falls within the ambit of the Community? That is to say, whether our work can touch on education. And before he answers I should like to say that I definitely take the view that admission to examinations and the like should be uniform throughout the Community.

**Mr Thorn.** — (*F*) This is precisely what I said just now when I said there were legal difficulties and differences of opinion between one delegation and the others, because all the Member States were represented. Even if Denmark was not represented at ministerial level, it was represented by its ambassador and permanent representative to the Communities, who, as you probably know, is the legitimate representative of your country in this Council, since he represents it in whatever Council it might be. The problem is that the Danish delegation feels some of the aspects covered by the resolution of 9 February 1976 do not come within the Community's terms of reference and that they can only be put into effect through intergovernmental cooperation. It should be noted that it was consequently opposed to recourse to Article 235 of the EEC Treaty for cases not covered by the Treaties. For these same reasons, your country's delegation, which, like all the other delegations, agreed to the substance of the conclusions, is opposed to action being taken solely as a result of the Council taking note of the general report of the Education Committee.

The resolution of 9 February 1976 is a mixed resolution. At this stage, therefore, the Danish delegation is in favour of resolutions, as long as they have some other legal basis, in other words, as long as they are purely intergovernmental.

**Mrs Dienesch.** — (*F*) Referring to an answer you have given, I should like to ask you, Mr President, if you do not feel that the terms of reference in education should be reviewed somewhat earlier than in four years' time. You did, of course, say that there is little likelihood of this in three months' time, but I nevertheless emphasize the need to consider the development of our young people and the new requirements we may face. All we have been offered today are problems to which solutions should have long since been found. Perhaps this Education Committee should now waste no more time before meeting again to study the new requirements of our young people. A great deal has been said about jobs and exchanges. All this seems to me to have been self-evident for some time, but I feel it might be a good time to draw the attention of all the governments to the need to envisage in their education systems possibilities of attracting our young people towards a more moral way of life. I believe essential needs are coming to light and exist. All the

youth movements show this. But we are confining ourselves to a very limited study of exchanges, which doubtless have practical objectives, but which are not in tendency aimed at restoring the values of our civilization.

**Mr Thorn.** — (*F*) Mrs Dienesch, I am aware of your interest in these matters, which concern culture and education. I conclude from this that the aim of your supplementary question is to try and speed up the procedure or to help to ensure that the work is continued. And I can only tell you that we shall ensure that the Education Committee continues its work. I shall quite simply be your messenger, or Parliament's messenger, in communicating the interest we have in such matters. I remember only too well a European Council meeting, or a summit meeting as it was known then, at which the President of the French Republic requested — and his request was supported by the other Heads of Government — that our Community should assume a dimension other than the purely economic dimension and become far more involved in cultural cooperation and education. I shall make my contribution but, as you will appreciate, there are limits to the opportunities available to me.

**President.** — I must remind the House that several speakers, when putting their supplementary questions, have asked several questions at once. This is not permitted by the Rules of Procedure. When putting a supplementary question only one question may be asked.

Question No 49 by Mr Seligman (H-220/80):

What consultation is the Council pursuing with their colleagues in the Council of Ministers of the International Energy Agency in order to achieve international harmonization of energy prices and taxes?

**Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Council.** — (*F*) As not all the Member States of the Community are members of the International Energy Agency, the Community as such is not represented. Although the Commission attends meetings of the Agency as an observer, the Council of Ministers cannot become involved, which excludes the possibility of our engaging in consultations of the type referred to by the honourable Member in his question.

**Mr Seligman.** — I am sure the President-in-Office of the Council is not satisfied with that answer. We get such a lot of cases of distortion of competition due to unequal prices of energy and I am sure that he is trying to do more about them than he said in his answer. A typical case is the tomato growers in southern England who pay 40 p a gallon for heavy oil, whereas the Dutch growers only pay 24p—60 % of what we have to pay in England. When is the Council

## Seligman

going to demand that the Dutch Government take action to harmonize the price of gas so that there is fair competition within the Community? At the moment British tomato growers are being forced out of business by the inequality.

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) On the formal question I have nothing to add to what I have just said, except that, to ensure that the Community mechanisms work adequately, the traditional procedure for the preparation of discussions held within the OECD is also used for the meetings of the various organs of the Agency. We are not represented in the Agency as a Community because not all the Member States belong to it, but at the preparatory stage we ensure that work is done at Community level. This takes the form of prior meetings between the relevant officials of the nine Member States and of the Commission. These meetings are usually held in Paris.

As regards the general principle of tax and price harmonization to which you have referred, the Commission has in fact put forward proposals to this end. It is quite obvious that if we want to make progress, as we do and as was indicated at the Venice summit, towards the general harmonization of an energy policy, this is one of the elements it will include. Until now the Finance Ministers, who are more particularly concerned, have refused to adopt this course of action and to give their blessing, but I believe that Venice marked a major step forward along this path and that we shall be induced to reconsider this problem from this angle.

**Mr Galland.** — (F) Following on from you have just said and in the context of this harmonization, which everyone, including the Council, wants, do you not think that the first thing to be done to achieve harmonization would be to ensure that, when tension occurs in the market, none of the nine countries of the Community obtains its supplies from the Rotterdam spot market? Have you any definite, realistic proposals in this regard?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) I agree that this is one of the problems, and it is one of the basic problems to which a solution should be found. As I do not enjoy the same freedom as you, I would perhaps not go so far as to say that it is the first problem to be tackled. I would point out that the Council has already taken action along these lines and has done everything to discourage this tendency, at least that is what it said at its recent meeting. I believe you are right: this is an area which should be given priority and on which we shall have to adopt a position.

**President.** — We now come to the questions to the Foreign Ministers of the nine Member States of the

European Community meeting in political cooperation.

Question No 62 by Mr van Miert (H-165/80):

Do the Foreign Ministers not consider that it is desirable and necessary to improve consultation with the United States through the appropriate channels, in view of the fact that the Foreign Ministers took a decision concerning Iran on 22 April last, manifestly unaware of the United States' decision to take military action, as a result of which the Secretary of State, Mr Vance, tendered his resignation on 21 April?

**Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs meeting in Political Cooperation.** — (F) The declaration on European identity published by the nine Foreign Ministers in Copenhagen on 13 December 1973 refers specifically to the close links between the United States and the Europe of the Nine, which share values and inspirations based on a common heritage.

According to the communiqué issued in Copenhagen in December 1973, 'These ties are mutually beneficial and must be preserved. They do not conflict with the determination of the Nine to establish themselves as a distinct and original entity. The Nine intend to maintain their constructive dialogue and to develop their cooperation with the United States on the basis of equality and in a spirit of friendship.'

Since that time, a constant exchange of views and ideas on the main problems in international politics has developed between the Nine and the United States on the basis of these principles. At the meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the Nine at Gymnich on 20 and 21 April 1974 it was agreed that the President-in-Office of the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation should have the permanent task of ensuring, each case being taken on its merits and a pragmatic approach being adopted, exchanges of communications and consultations between the Nine and the United States. The many serious crises throughout the world and their effect on the climate of international relations call for very close and increasingly effective consultation with the United States on questions of mutual interest, notwithstanding the differences in attitude and responsibility. It is to this that the presidency will apply itself.

**President.** — Since its author is absent, Question No 63 will be answered in writing<sup>1</sup>.

Question No 64 by Mr Fergusson (H-197/80):

Will the Foreign Ministers say what steps they have taken or are considering, meeting in political cooperation, to protect the civilian population of the Community from

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

**President**

the harmful effects of the possible use of nuclear, biological or chemical weapons in the event of war in the European theatre?

and Question No 65 by Mr Hutton (H-225/80):

In view of the answer given by the President-in-Office to Question No 63 (H-26/80) of 21 May 1980, would the President-in-Office agree that the process he described is wholly inadequate to determine and prevent the current use of chemical weapons in warfare?

Since both these questions deal with the same subject, they may be taken together.

**Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs.** — (F) These two questions may be considered from two separate aspects, that of defence as such and that of international law.

As far as the first aspect is concerned, it should be pointed out that the problems raised by the honourable Members have not been considered within the framework of European political cooperation since there has been no move towards concerted action in this area. The Presidency is therefore unable to reply on behalf of the Nine. The problems which relate to defence in the strictest sense are of course dealt with individually by each of the nine Member States at national level. There is also cooperation at international level within the relevant bodies.

From the point of view of international law, these questions provide an opportunity to demonstrate the active role played by the Nine, both individually and jointly, in the relevant international spheres in promoting the adoption of practical measures, the preparation and conclusion of new legal conventions and the observance of existing conventions, in order to prevent the use of certain specified weapons capable of causing massive destruction, and, in more general terms, in order to attain the ultimate objective of general and total disarmament under effective international supervision, as called for once again by Mr Colombo on behalf of the nine Member States of the European Community at the United Nations' Committee on Disarmament.

The active concern of the Nine is also demonstrated by the great importance attached to banning the production of chemical weapons. Recently, when resolution 34/72 was adopted by the United Nations' General Assembly, the Nine agreed unanimously on the urgent need to begin multilateral negotiations within the Geneva Committee on Disarmament for the purpose of drawing up a draft convention on total and effective prohibition of development, production and storage of chemical weapons and elimination of existing stocks. The Nine therefore warmly welcomed the recent decision by the Geneva Committee on Disarmament to set up an *ad hoc* working party responsible

for carrying out detailed studies during the 1980 session to decide what aspects should be discussed during the negotiations on the aforementioned convention, taking account of all the proposals which have already been made on the subject and of any possible future initiatives.

**Mr Fergusson.** — I hope that in view of the somewhat curt nature of the President-in-Office's reply to my question you will forgive a sort of double supplementary in reply to it, because if he cannot answer one, then he must answer the other one. It goes as follows. If the Foreign Ministers are unable to give an appropriate reply to a question intimately affecting the safety and health and survival of the civilian community who elected this Parliament, would the President-in-Office say to which Ministers meeting in political cooperation questions about safeguarding the people against atomic and biological and chemical warfare should be directed? Would he not agree that civil defence is a highly proper matter for Community study and that research and even procurement in this field might be economically and practically rewarding? In other words, will the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation consider putting this matter on their agenda in future?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) I quite understand the honourable Member. Indeed, this subject is one of many which may be seen to fall under two distinct headings. But I think it is also taking things too far to say that it is purely a question of civil defence. The prohibition of certain weapons, such as chemical weapons, has nothing to do with civil defence, it is a question of defence itself. The use of certain weapons may, of course, have consequences which come within the scope of civil defence. That is why the governments of the Member States have considered up until now that these questions are the responsibility of the Ministers of Defence. That is why they have felt that the majority of us, with the exception of Ireland that is, should discuss the question within the framework of NATO, and not political cooperation. I will gladly pass on your request if you wish me to do so. All I can do is describe to you the procedures involved and the decisions taken so far.

**Mr Hutton.** — Is the President-in-Office of the Council quite serious in saying that the Nine can be pleased that the Geneva Committee on Disarmament has only set up an *ad hoc* working party to think about the possibility of *perhaps* looking into ways of dealing with chemical weapons, when they are presently being used in warfare in Laos and Afghanistan and when the American Congressional Subcommittee on Oversight, in its recently published report on Soviet biological warfare activities, has shown that the Soviet Union is now turning over pharmaceutical factories to the production of biological weapons? Can the President-

**Hutton**

in-Office not tell us that this is a wholly unsatisfactory procedure for dealing with such a serious matter and can the Nine not use its strength and influence to bring about a very much more urgent procedure for the prohibiting of the production and use of these weapons?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) Let us try to distinguish the questions involved here. I would say to the honourable Member that my reaction to the news that certain weapons were being used in Afghanistan was one of horror also; we are of the same opinion.

Secondly, at the time when the Nine expressed satisfaction here at the setting up of the Disarmament Committee the news of these events had not reached us. I feel bound to point out this fact as the text was actually drawn up under the Italian presidency.

Thirdly, I know that these words may be regarded as rather non-committal by the Members of this Assembly. But if you are aware of the difficulties to be overcome in drawing up this type of text you will not ask that we try to speed things up. Do not forget that only some of the Nine are represented on this committee, and that they do not much like being rushed by the others who do not necessarily share the same responsibilities and the same point of view on the subject of arms. As the representative of a very small country I can understand your reaction, but this is a very delicate question and one which our governments, particularly within the framework of the Nine, will approach only very cautiously.

**President.** — Question No 66 by Mr Penders (H-231/80):

What practical measures have been taken with regard to the Madrid follow-up conference in November 1980?

**Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs.** — (F) With a view to preparations for the Madrid meeting which is expected to begin on 11 November 1980 as part of the follow up to the CSCE Conference, the Nine will continue, within the framework of European political cooperation, to maintain the close collaboration which was started at the outset of the CSCE proceedings.

The Nine are thus in the process of preparing their joint positions with regard both to formal, procedural and organizational problems, etc., and to the problems of substance which are expected to be raised at the Madrid meeting. With regard to the organization, timetable and other arrangements for the Madrid meeting, the Nine consider that the preparatory meeting to be held in the Spanish capital from 9 September 1980 onwards, at which such questions will be decided, should base its discussions on the report drawn up at the Belgrade Conference, generally

referred to as the yellow book, which seems to answer most of the present needs arising in connection with the organization of the work of the Madrid meeting.

With regard to questions of substance, the Nine are currently preparing joint texts on major themes, which may be used in Madrid by the delegations of the Nine during the opening statements and the discussion of the implementation of the final act. These themes, which will be situated in an international context both before and during the meeting, will cover the following areas: détente and the CSCE process; first basket of the final act: principles, military aspects of security; second basket: questions relating to security and cooperation in the Mediterranean; third basket: human contacts, information, culture and education, follow up to the conference.

The joint proposals to be submitted by the Nine at the Madrid meeting should help to further the CSCE process in all areas of the final act, and in particular with regard to military aspects of security, and cooperation in humanitarian and other fields: human contacts and information.

In drawing up these proposals the Nine are paying due attention to the fact that the final act represents — as I believe I said this morning — a balanced whole and that therefore no one part should be over-emphasized at the expense of the others.

**Mr Penders.** — (NL) How do the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation intend to ensure that a European Disarmament Conference, the mandate for which is to be discussed in Madrid, will likewise be held within the overall context of the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) Such amendments come within what we consider to be the scope of the first basket. It is within this framework also that our associates should endeavour during the preparatory conference to draw up a mandate on our behalf.

**Mrs Maij-Weggen.** — (NL) The President-in-Office of the Council said earlier that this conference would *probably* be held. According to a number of press reports the Council of Ministers, or at least certain members of the Council of Ministers, have reasons for wanting to hold up this conference. Can the President-in-Office confirm this, and if so, can he indicate the reasons behind it?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) I am sure that the conference will take place. The word 'probably' applied simply to the date of 11 November, but I regard that too as definite.

**President.** — Question No 67 by Mr Lalor (H-249/80):

The Nine have stated that they are convinced that the Islamic and non-aligned countries have a particularly important part to play in bringing about a solution to the Afghanistan crisis<sup>1)</sup>. Would the ministers elaborate on how this might be done following the Islamic Conference in Islamabad?

**Mr Thorn, President-in-Office of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs.** — (F) In its statement of 28 April 1980 the European Council reaffirmed the view of the Nine that a solution to the problem could be found, in accordance with the resolution of the United Nations' General Assembly, through a formula allowing Afghanistan to remain uninvolved in the struggle between world powers and enabling it to return to its former position as a neutral and non-aligned State.

The Nine said that they were ready to offer their support, together with friendly and allied States, for any initiative designed to promote such a solution, and they considered that the Islamic and non-aligned States had a particularly important role to play.

Since then the eleventh Conference of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic States has taken place, as you know, and the European Council meeting in Venice on 12 and 13 June 1980 shared the anxiety expressed by the Islamic States and agreed with their conclusions with regard to the continuing Soviet military presence in Afghanistan. The Council reacted with great interest to the setting up of a committee responsible for examining all possible ways of finding an overall solution to the serious crisis in Afghanistan, and reaffirmed its support for all meaningful initiatives aimed at promoting a solution.

**Mr Lalor.** — Is the President-in-Office satisfied that there is sufficient political cooperation within the Nine on this issue? Could they collectively or individually, in conjunction with the non-aligned countries, do more towards resolving the Afghanistan problem, where a solution is so vital? Is the President-in-Office, speaking on behalf of the Nine, satisfied that sufficient is being done, and could not more be done through the non-aligned in an effort to try and resolve this problem?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) Of course we are not satisfied. Who amongst us could be satisfied all the time no solution has been found to the Afghanistan problem? I made it perfectly clear this morning, speaking on my own behalf and on behalf of the Nine, that the Nine will not accept that the Afghanistan question has been solved until the day when all Soviet troops have left Afghanistan.

Secondly, we are asked if we have exhausted all possible contacts? It is difficult to list them all in detail here. But please believe me when I tell you that we have forged contacts at all levels and in all quarters where we thought some influence could be exercised.

Thirdly, what is essential here is that the Soviets should be given the genuine impression that they have been outlawed by the international community and are up against a united front and unanimous standpoint, of peoples belonging not just to the Atlantic Alliance or the Western nations. This is why we have attached particular importance to establishing contacts with the ASEAN countries, with the countries of South-East Asia, with the countries of the Middle-East and with the Islamic countries, to demonstrate the solidarity of the non-aligned states and of the Western nations on this subject.

We have had the impression, particularly during recent weeks, that the Soviets did not expect such a unanimous reaction and that this general and virtually universal disapproval has a considerable impact. It does not exclude the possibility of any Western state taking individual or bilateral initiatives and holding bilateral meetings, as in the case of the Chancellor's visit to Moscow and the French President's discussions with General Secretary Brezhnev in Warsaw. Everyone may attempt to do as much as possible bilaterally to achieve the aim I have described. But, in addition to bilateral action using diplomatic channels and all other means available, there is still a place for these declarations of principle which will, it is hoped, gain the support of other international bodies and isolate the Soviets, with the sole aim of persuading them to withdraw their troops from Afghanistan.

**Mr Spicer.** — I am sure we would all agree with the President-in-Office that the views of the United Nations carry some weight. However, would he not also agree that, in a situation where we are faced with an absolutely open violation of all the Treaties that have ever been signed since the Second World War, we should perhaps take a more independent line than that taken by the UN, because at the end of the day the UN confines itself to words and setting up committees? I would have thought that if I were in the position of the USSR, I would not pay very much attention in the long term to resolutions from the United Nations. Could we not take our own stand much more as a Community, the most powerful Community in the world?

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) I think there is some confusion here. Firstly, we perhaps differ in our assessment of the value of the United Nations. I perhaps have a higher opinion of it than you do; but when I was talking just now I did not mention the United Nations. I spoke of an effort to gather together as many countries of the world as possible sharing a common stand-

(<sup>1</sup>) Answer to Oral Question No H-121/80 of 21. 5. 1980.



**Thorn**

point. I spoke of the united front which we are trying to establish with the countries of the region, the Islamic countries, this seems to us to be a matter of particular importance. If the Community of Nine were to adopt a position in the form of a declaration or a motion in which it was not supported by the bordering States, the neighbours of Afghanistan, it must surely be admitted that our decision would thereby lose some of its moral force.

With regard to the adoption of a declaration by the Nine without the support of other countries, this has already been done, the Nine have already adopted positions without waiting to be joined by other States. If you are not thinking of declarations, exhortation or verbal demands, then I do not know what you are thinking of. We must go carefully, but I am, of course, anxious to hear your suggestions.

**Lord Harmar-Nicholls.** — Does not the President-in-Office think that the Community of Nine ought now to dissuade members from bilateral meetings in public, because when these meetings are held and nothing seems to flow from them, it does appear to strengthen the hand of the Russian invaders and is more likely to lead uncommitted nations to believe that they are the ones they ought to support? The diplomatic approach, as the President-in-Office has said, is acceptable, but the public approach of the kind we have witnessed over recent months can only reflect or give the impression of weakness.

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) I do not consider that the existence of the Community has brought all bilateral relations to an end, and I think it would be unrealistic to suppose that Community relations have completely replaced all bilateral relations between the Member States, and above all, between individual Member States and non-Member States. We must be realistic and see things as they are! Other than that, the honourable Member makes a value judgement which is purely his personal opinion. I am not so pessimistic as he is and I do not agree with his conclusions regarding certain bilateral meetings, on the contrary.

**President.** — Question No 68 by Mr Israël (H-250/80):

Have the Foreign Ministers adopted a joint position for the Madrid Conference? What specific proposals do they intend to put forward and what instructions do they intend to give to the council?

**Mr Thorn.** *President-in-Office of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs.* — (F) In accordance with the approach adopted by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, the Nine are preparing joint positions for the Madrid meeting within the framework of political cooperation.

This collaboration covers both procedural and organizational matters relating to the next meeting and the formulation of joint proposals regarding all aspects of the final act.

With regard to the military aspects of security, the Nine are continuing their work along the lines specified in the statement by the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of 20 November 1979. They are also studying specific initiatives concerning, amongst other things, economic and commercial information, human contacts, working conditions for journalists and the circulation of printed information, and exchanges of students, teachers and scholars. In drawing up all these proposals the Nine will take account of the fact that the final act constitutes a balanced whole and that, therefore, no one part should be given more attention than the others.

**Mr Israël.** — (F) Thank you for your reply, Mr President. I was somewhat taken aback by the force with which you stated that no one basket should take priority over the others. I was also struck by the fact that in speaking of the third basket you did not even mention the words 'human rights'. I would therefore ask you whether, with regard to the defence of human rights, you would consider the possibility of maintaining certain permanent committees on human rights which could be set up at the Madrid Conference and would be responsible for ensuring that pressure is continually brought to bear and for monitoring the progress achieved in the area of détente.

I would also ask you if you are in favour of following the United Nations and UNESCO in granting the official status of non-governmental organizations to the committees which have become known throughout the world as 'Helsinki watchdog committees'. This seems to me of vital importance, particularly as we are demonstrating a somewhat incomprehensive indifference towards these committees which are widely spread throughout Europe, particularly Eastern Europe.

**Mr Thorn.** — (F) I think there are various questions to be dealt with here. Firstly, you say you are surprised at the firmness with which I stated that all baskets should be given equal attention. This is indeed a vital aspect of our position. We know what some people want and what others do not want and we believe that compromise may be difficult to obtain but that we must continue to strive for it and must not deviate from this aim. The Helsinki Agreement must be applied in its entirety, with all baskets and without placing greater stress on one while neglecting some aspect of another. I say again that we must be firm on this matter.

You then raised the question of human rights and expressed surprise that I did not mention the subject. I

**Thorn**

did not list it among the three baskets because human rights are referred to in the preamble and not contained in any of the three baskets. You may rest assured that I have not in any way overlooked human rights.

In your third question you asked me whether permanent committees should not be set up in Madrid. I should tell you that up until now, and this will remain the case unless there is some change in legal principles or basic attitudes during preparations for the Madrid Conference, the majority of Member States have been opposed to the setting up of official committees. It should not be forgotten that some people also wished to set up committees between conferences, and we rejected this principle for reasons which may be gone into on another occasion. This is why it was thought better to go from one conference to another, without setting up a whole institutional apparatus with official committees. To accept them in one context would mean accepting them in others.

With regard to the last part of your question, one might initially be tempted to take such a step. But you should not, however, forget the purpose of the Helsinki Conference, of the Belgrade Conference and of the Madrid Conference. As soon as you admit non-governmental organizations you will completely change the dimension of these conferences.

Also, you should remember that the agreement of all sides is required. I cannot imagine us getting this agreement and in any case I do not see how it could be either useful or productive, since we would then have to obtain agreement on every subsequent occasion

during negotiations and discussions. It is one thing for responsible governments to negotiate such an agreement and quite another to expect non-governmental organizations to do the same. I have given you my immediate and personal reaction to your proposal, but I would very much like to find out the reactions of my colleagues. They may disagree with me, as sometimes happens, but on this occasion I doubt it.

**President.** — Question Time is closed <sup>1</sup>.

#### 14. *Agenda for next sitting*

**President.** — The next sitting will be held tomorrow, Wednesday, 9 July 1980, with the following agenda:

9 a. m. and 3 p. m.:

- Vote on several requests for urgent procedure
- Statements on the proposals for the total rejection of the 1980 budget
- von Bismarck report on the Community's economic development during the first half of 1980

3 p. m.: Vote on the proposals for the total rejection of the 1980 budget and on the motions for resolutions on which the debate has closed.

The sitting is closed.

(*The sitting was closed at 7.05 p. m.*)

<sup>1</sup> See Annex.

## ANNEX

*Questions which could not be answered during  
Question Time, with written answers*

## 1. Questions to the Council

*Question No 51, by Mr Penders (H-230/80)*

Subject: CSCE (Madrid follow-up conference)

What practical measures have been taken with regard to the Madrid CSCE follow-up conference in November 1980?

*Answer*

The preparatory work for the second conference provided for by the Final Act of the CSCE, to which the Community attaches particular importance, is continuing apace both within the Political Co-operation bodies and within the Community framework on those issues which come within the Community's competence.

The Community's contribution to the Madrid conference will of course have to be seen within the broader framework of the objectives and strategy of the Nine, which it is for the Political Co-operation bodies to define. They intend to arrive at definitive guidelines in September.

As a contribution to the framing of these guidelines the Community bodies are currently preparing the files for the two major aspects of the work programme envisaged for Madrid, namely the examination of the implementation of the Final Act of the CSCE and the new proposals likely to be put forward at this Conference. Particular attention is being paid to comparing the economic and technical merits of certain topics which could be the subject of Community initiatives in Madrid.

These proceedings should be completed by the end of July.

\*

\*   \*

*Question No 52 by Mr Fuchs (H-232/80)*

Subject: Directive on measurements and weights of commercial vehicles

Does the Council not consider that a decision on a directive (or regulation) on the measurements and weights of commercial vehicles is urgently required in view of the fact that such a decision could help to promote energy-saving by reducing the fuel consumed per tonne carried?

*Answer*

On 4 January 1979 the Commission submitted to the Council a proposal for a Directive on the weight and certain other characteristics (not including dimensions) of road vehicles used for the carriage of goods. In its proposal, the Commission considered that an increase in the maximum authorized weight would result in a gain in payload in relation to fuel consumption and would thus be worthwhile from the point of view of energy saving. This aspect of the proposal, although but one of many problems, merits further study.

However, the Council cannot adopt a position on the matter as the Parliament has not yet delivered its Opinion.

\*

\*   \*

*Question No 53, by Mr Ansquer (H-239/80)*

Subject: Economic situation in the Community and enlargement

Does the Council not agree that the difficulties experienced recently in the European Community in the economic, budgetary and agricultural fields call into question the proposed enlargement of the Community to include Spain and Portugal? What conclusions does the Council draw from these developments?

*Answer*

At the outset of the negotiations on accession, it was agreed by both sides that negotiation meetings should follow a certain timetable, namely at least three meetings a year at ministerial level and two meetings every three months at Deputy level. This timetable has been adhered to so far and the Presidency intends to continue to adhere to it in the future, since the work to be done covers the whole range of the Communities' activities and thus is of necessity wide-ranging, which in itself justifies maintenance of the frequency of the negotiating meetings at a sustained level.

Of course, developments in internal proceedings within the Community with regard to the problems with which it has to deal, in particular in the case of the common agricultural policy and own resources, will inevitably affect the position adopted by the Community in due course on these vital negotiation chapters in the negotiations with Spain and Portugal. It should also be remembered that the negotiations are based on the principle laid down by the Community at the opening of the negotiations and accepted by the applicant countries of the acceptance by Spain and Portugal of the 'acquis communautaire' as it stands on the date of their accession, including therefore any changes in it between now and accession.

\*

\*   \*

*Question No 54, by Mrs le Roux (H-241/80)*

Subject: Free movement of milk within the Community

Would the Council not agree that the United Kingdom is protecting itself from imports of liquid milk by means of unfair health regulations which constitute an insuperable non-tariff barrier to trade and thus violate the principle of the free movement of goods within the Community, whereas the French regulations applicable to drinking milk fully safeguard the interests of the consumer? Would it not also agree that it is urgent and necessary to correct this illegal situation? If so, what action does it intend to take?

*Answer*

The Council is aware of the existence of divergent national health rules which may constitute a barrier to intra-Community trade in drinking milk. In order to harmonize these regulations, the Commission submitted in 1971 two proposals for Directives laying down the health requirements which must be met by

- untreated milk intended for heat-treatment
- heat-treated milk intended for direct human consumption.

Although the proceedings in the Council's subordinate bodies have reached the final stage, it has been necessary to postpone the adoption of these texts by the Council as certain delegations are not yet in a position to adopt an official position on the finalized texts.

\*

\*   \*

*Question No 55 by Mr Wurtz (H-247/80)*

Subject: Exclusion from public sector employment in the FRG

Would the Council not agree that the practice of excluding citizens of the FRG engaged in a wide variety of occupations from employment in the public sector (*Berufsverbot*) because of their beliefs or

their affiliation to certain legally recognized parties is in flagrant breach of the principles of nondiscrimination and equality of treatment before the law, which are the cornerstone of all democratic regimes?

*Answer*

The question put by the Honourable Member does not fall within the Council's competence.

\*

\* \*

*Question No 56, by Mr Lalor (H-248/80)*

Subject: Closing loopholes in trade sanctions with Iran

What action will the Council take to close the loopholes whereby EEC trade sanctions against Iran could be broken by the shipment of goods to Dubai or Kuwait and then across the Gulf to Iranian ports?

*Answer*

The embargo measures decided on by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the nine Member States in Naples on 18 May 1980 have been implemented by means of national measures.

Although most of these measures do not expressly make provision for the case of the transit of goods through a third country, they do, however, ban all exports the final destination of which is Iran.

The task of suppressing fraudulent activities is the responsibility of the Member States. The conditions for intervention by the Community institutions are laid down in Articles 224 and 225 of the EEC Treaty and therefore concern only the case where the application of national embargo measures would affect the proper functioning of the Common Market.

\*

\* \*

*Question No 57, by Mr Antoniozzi (H-251/80): deferred*

*Question No 5, by Miss Hooper (H-256/80): deferred*

\*

\* \*

*Question No 59, by Mr Deleau (H-265/80)*

Subject: USA/European Community steel war

As the iron and steel conflict between the USA and the EEC appears to be leading towards a several million tonne reduction in European exports to the United States, and now that the European steel industry in general seems to be on the point of recovery, does the Council not think it would be advisable to warn the USA now that Europe would be forced to reduce its import quotas for steel products from third countries by an amount corresponding to any penalties imposed on it by the USA.

*Answer*

The Council is keeping a close watch on the course of the anti-dumping complaints against most Community steel producers and notes with growing disquiet that these procedures have begun to create serious difficulties for Community exports of iron and steel products to the United States.

Within the Council, discussions are continuing with the aim of mutual exchanges of information on the developing situation and the joint definition of a defence strategy for the various stages of the United States enquiry. In the same framework the position of the Community's representative on the OECD Steel Committee has been finalized; the Community has clearly indicated that it regrets the decision of the United States Administration to suspend the trigger price mechanism, as this measure has undermined the consensus reached within the OECD in 1977 by the principal steel producing countries.

I would however remind the Honourable Member that the United States authorities have not yet taken any final decision on the anti-dumping complaints. Given the timetable laid down by United States law, these decisions will probably be taken in October/November of this year.

In the light of the decisions taken in Washington the Council will then — or possibly sooner if the situation calls for it — examine the matter again to decide on whatever measures seem necessary.

\*

\*   \*

*Question No 60, by Mrs Scrivener (H-280/80)*

*Question No 61, by Mr Curry (H-287/80)*

Subject: Supplementary levy on the dairy sector

Following the agreement of the Council to impose a supplementary levy on the dairy sector if milk production this year is more than 1 ½ per cent above that recorded in 1979, will the Council explain at what date it expects to receive clear indication of the trend of the milk levy and from what date if it is clear that milk production has increased by 1 ½ per cent; what form the levy will take and what plans it has to ensure that the levy is imposed only on those regions which show a production increase and that no supplementary levy will be imposed on those areas and producers which have observed market and production disciplines?

*Answer*

It is for the Commission, within its powers relating to implementation of Community legislation and management of the market, to establish how much milk will be produced during the 1980 calendar year. This figure may be established after 1 January 1981 to enable the Commission to take it into account in its proposal to the Council for the fixing of the co-responsibility levy for the 1981/1982 marketing year, which will be applied as from 1 April 1981, and for the application of this levy.

The Council will decide in good time, on the basis of a proposal by the Commission, on the form and details of any supplementary levy that might be necessary for the 1981/1982 marketing year, in the event of production increasing by 1.5 % or more.

\*

\*   \*

## *2. Questions to the Foreign Ministers*

*Question No 69, by Mr Seligman (H-259/80)*

Subject: Accession of the European Community to the Convention of the European Space Agency

In view of the political importance of space cooperation for the Community and the need to take decisions concerning the future of the European Space Agency at the highest political level, will the Foreign Ministers now authorize negotiations for the accession of the Community to the Convention of the European Space Agency?

*Answer*

'As the Foreign Ministers meeting in political cooperation have not discussed the matter raised by the Honourable Member, the President regrets that he is unable to answer this question on behalf of the Nine. This does not mean, however, that the Foreign Ministers are unaware of the great importance

of cooperation between their countries, most of which are in fact parties to the convention in question, in the field of space research.'

\*

\* \*

*Question No 70, by Miss Clwyd (H-278/80)*

Subject: Contravention of Code of Conduct on South Africa, relating to minimum wage level

What is the Council's view of recent allegations that at least 20 % of African workers employed by British companies in South Africa are paid below the minimum level recommended by the EEC Code of Conduct and will the Council ensure that a full list of those companies contravening the spirit of the Code of Conduct be made public?

*Question No 71, by Mr Hume (H-279/80)*

Subject: Employment conditions for European companies in South Africa

Does the Council know of any European Companies infringing the code of employment laid down by the Council for European Companies operating in South Africa and if so, will the Council name such companies and state what action can be taken against such companies?

*Joint answer*

'The code of conduct of 20/9/77 for European companies with subsidiaries in South Africa was adopted by the Nine in the framework of European political cooperation. Implementation of the code is a matter for the individual Member States of the Community which have drawn it to the attention of the firms concerned with a recommendation that they adhere to its provisions.

The code of conduct is not binding. Failure on the part of firms in a particular Member State to adhere to the code and the publication of a list of such firms is a matter for the government of the Member State concerned.

The Nine hope that the firms concerned will increasingly come to realize that it is in their interests to actively help to promote the economic and social advancement of the African workers employed by their South African subsidiaries.

The Nine are currently considering national assessments by the governments concerned of an initial series of reports on companies.'

\*

\* \*

*Question No 72, by Mrs Lizin (H-285/80)*

Subject: European legal area

Could the Foreign Ministers indicate the current position regarding the agreements reached on the European legal area, the deadline for their implementation and the progress made on work within the Trevi Group?

*Answer*

The Justice Ministers met in Rome on 19 June last to consider the progress made on the draft cooperation agreement on penal matters.

At several meetings of senior officials a draft agreement had been prepared with a view to its being submitted for signature in Rome. However, certain difficulties raised at the meeting of the Justice Ministers prevented the agreement from being signed. It was decided therefore to have these difficulties examined within the context of political cooperation.

The Trevi Group was set up in Rome at the European Council of 1-2 December 1975 to tackle problems not directly connected with the European legal area. Within the context of this Group's activities the Ministers for Home Affairs and the Ministers responsible for security have met four times since 28 June 1976, the last of these meetings being held on 23 October 1979. In the interval between these ministerial meetings working parties have been meeting to coordinate the efforts of the Nine in their struggle against terrorism and crime. No draft agreement is as yet in course of preparation.

\*

\*   \*

*Question No 63, by Mr Romualdi (H-254/80, formerly O-22/80)*

Subject: Attacks on Libyan refugees in Community countries

What security measures does the Council intend to take to put a stop to the series of savage murders of Libyan refugees in the countries of the Community and to the activities of the hired assassins acting with the backing of the authorities in their country, following the threats made on various occasions by the Libyan Head of State Colonel Gaddafi whose intention it is in this way to eliminate all opposition to his regime and all dissidents?

*Answer*

Although most information about the policies being pursued in the many countries of the world, Libya amongst them, are of interest to the Nine and can give rise to discussion amongst them in certain circumstances, the measures to which the honourable Member refers do not come directly within the scope of political cooperation and have not formed the subject of discussion in this context.



## SITTING OF WEDNESDAY; 9 JULY 1980

1. Approval of minutes . . . . .	114	Rejection of the motion . . . . .	148
2. Documents received . . . . .	114	Luster report (Doc. 1-148/80/rev.): Amend- ment of Parliament's Rules of Procedure:	
3. Membership of Parliament . . . . .	114	Mr Coppieters; Mr Nyborg, Chairman of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions; Mr Rogers; Mrs Hammerich . . . .	148
4. Decision on urgency:		Amendments to the motion for a resolution:	
Mr Israel; Mr Glinne; Mr Seal; Mr de la Malène (EPD); Mr d'Ormesson (EPP); Mr Galland (L); Mr Herman (EPP); Mr Walter; Mr Calvez (L); Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein- Berleburg; Mr Moreland (ED) . . . . .	114	Mr Luster, rapporteur; . . . . .	151
5. Proposals for total rejection of the 1980 budget:		Mr Pannella . . . . .	151
Mr Balfe; Mr Pannella; Mr Glinne (S); Mr Langes (EPP); Mr Scott-Hopkins (ED); Mr Baillot; Mrs Scrivener (L); Mr Ansquer (EPD); Mr Bonde; Mr Spinelli; Mr Blaney; Mr Romualdi; Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission . . . . .	117	Amendments to Rule 14:	
6. Agenda . . . . .	123	Mr Luster; Mr D'Angelosante . . . . .	151
7. Economic development of the Community in the first half of 1980 — Report (Doc. 1-288/ 80) by Mr von Bismarck on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs:		Points of order: Mr Luster; Mr Blaney; Lord Harmar-Nicholls; Mr Blaney . . . . .	152
Mr von Bismarck, rapporteur . . . . .	123	Amendments to Rule 26(3):	
Mr Delors (S); Mr Beumer (EPP); Mr Hopper (ED); Mr Bonaccini (COM); Mr De Clercq (L); Mr Poncelet (EPD); Mrs Castel- lina; Mr De Goede; Mr Rogers; Mr Macario; Mr Møller; Mr Pranchère; Mr Almirante; Mrs Castle; Mr Herman; Sir Brandon Rhys Williams; Mr Petronio; Mr Bonde; Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission; Mr von Bismarck . . . . .	125	Mr Luster; Mr D'Angelosante; Mr Nyborg; Mr Blaney; Mrs Vayssade; Mr Chambeiron; Mr von der Vring; Mr Patterson; Mr Nyborg . . . .	152
8. Urgent procedure . . . . .	146	Point of order: Mr Ferri, Chairman of the Affairs Committee . . . . .	153
9. Votes:		Amendments to Rule 31 A:	
Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-294/80) by Mr Balfe and others: Total rejection of the 1980 budget:		Mr Luster; Mr Blaney . . . . .	154
Point of order: Mr Pannella . . . . .	147	Consideration of the motion for a resolution:	
Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets; Mr Pannella . . . . .	147	Mr Sieglerschmidt . . . . .	154
Rejection of the motion . . . . .	147	Amendment before the first indent of the preamble:	
Point of order: Mr Lomas; Mrs Castle; Mr Seal; Mr Lomas; Mr Pannella; Mr Damseaux . . . .	147	Mr Luster . . . . .	154
Motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-300/80) by Mr Pannella and others: Total rejection of the 1980 budget:		Amendment after the second indent of the preamble:	
		Mr Luster; Mr Blaney . . . . .	154
		Points of order: Mr Luster; Mr De Goede; Mr Galland; Mr Patterson . . . . .	155
		Mr Blaney . . . . .	156
		Explanations of vote: Mrs Vayssade (S); Mr Klepsch (EPP); Mr Patterson (ED); Mr D'Angelosante (COM); Mr Galland (L); Mr Coppieters; Mr Sieglerschmidt; Mr Nyborg, Chairman of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions; Mr Luster . . . . .	156
		Explanations of vote: Lord Harmar- Nicholls, Mr Blaney (I); Mr Ferri, Chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee; Explanations of vote: Mr Pannella; Mr Arndt; Mrs Dekker; Mr Møller; Mr Capanna; Mr Bonde . . . .	159
		Point of order: Mr Enright . . . . .	163
		von Bismarck report (Doc. 1-288/80): Eco- nomic development of the Community in the first half of 1980:	
		Amendment to paragraph 1:	
		Mr von Bismarck, rapporteur . . . . .	163

<i>Amendment to paragraph 4:</i>		<i>Adoption of the resolution</i>	164
<i>Mr von Bismarck</i>	164	10. <i>Urgent procedure</i>	164
<i>Amendment to paragraph 11:</i>		11. <i>Agenda for next sitting</i>	164
<i>Mr von Bismarck</i>	164	<i>Annex</i>	165
<i>Amendment to paragraph 15:</i>			
<i>Mr von Bismarck</i>	164		

#### IN THE CHAIR: MR JAQUET

##### *Vice-President*

*(The sitting was opened at 9 a.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is open.

##### 1. *Approval of minutes*

**President.** — The minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting have been distributed. Since there are no comments, the minutes of proceedings are approved.

##### 2. *Documents received*

**President.** — I have received from Members and from the parliamentary committees a number of documents, details of which will be found in the minutes of proceedings.

##### 3. *Membership of Parliament*

**President.** — Mr Claude Labbé has informed me of his resignation, with effect from 9 July 1980, as Member of the European Parliament. It is noted by the Assembly, pursuant to the second subparagraph of Article 12(2) of the Act concerning the election of the representatives of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage, that there is a vacancy and the Member State concerned will be informed thereof.

##### 4. *Decision on urgency*

**President.** — The first item is the decision on the urgency of three motions for resolutions. We shall begin with the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-301/80/rev.) by Mr Israel and others.*

*Humanitarian aid to Kampuchea.*

I call Mr Israel.

**Mr Israel.** — (F) Mr President, we felt that the situation along the border between Cambodia and Thailand was a serious challenge to the civilized world. In this area there are not only cross-border raids by the armed forces of one of these countries, but we also have a tremendous flow of men, women and children which poses a threat to all of us.

The aim of this motion, which is purely humanitarian in tone, is to bring this area back within the civilized world as far as we can. I shall speak out in favour of the various proposals which have been made during the debate, but I do feel that urgent procedure is absolutely vital, particularly because of the enormous risks to children, especially little girls, along the border between Cambodia and Thailand.

**President.** — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

The motion for a resolution will be placed on the agenda of the sitting of Friday, 11 July.

We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-307/80) by Mr Seal and others: Neutron bomb.*

**President**

I call Mr Glinne.

**Mr Glinne.** — (F) Mr President, the great majority of the Socialist Group feels that this is an important issue which needs to be discussed, especially in connection with the run-up to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe which is scheduled for Madrid this autumn.

As for procedure on this matter, we do not think that Rule 14 is the right approach. The matter has to be looked at calmly. As a result, although the Socialist Group supports consideration of the matter on the basis of Rule 25, we are against considering it under Rule 14.

**President.** — I call Mr Seal.

**Mr Seal.** — Mr President, Mr Glinne has already stressed how important this matter is and obviously he has pointed out that there is a difference of opinion within the Socialist Group. But I am sure that all reasonable people in this House are against arms proliferation. I am sure that all Members of this House are horrified at the thought of nuclear war. I am sure that all the people in this House are appalled at the escalation of bigger and more lethally effective weapons. And I am sure that no one in this House could be against the sentiments expressed in this resolution. And if it fails, as Mr Glinne said, it will be pursued by the Socialist Group. If it fails to be the subject of an urgent debate today, it will be pursued and it will be followed up. This is not the last we have heard of this.

But, Mr President, I have to convince the House on two points today in spite of what Mr Glinne has said. The first is whether this matter falls within the competence of this House. One effective function — in fact one of the only effective functions — of this Parliament is to bring important points to the attention of the world's press. We have already set precedents about discussing arms proliferation and other matters concerned with defence. But as the European Parliament, Mr President, we must be concerned with anything that threatens all life within all Member States.

And then on the urgency side, the French Government made its announcement and then sat back to await the reaction. If there is no reaction, or if the reaction is diluted, then it will go ahead and produce this horrific weapon. If there is a massive outcry, then it may take notice. Even the French Government is not totally impervious to public opinion.

Mr President, the other point is that this House is to hold no more part-sessions until September. And by then I assume the French will be manufacturing this weapon. We must act and we must act now. We must leave no doubt in the minds of anyone — anyone in

any Member State — about our total opposition to these new and horrific weapons of death.

**President.** — I call Mr de la Malène to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mr de la Malène.** — (F) Mr President, this is not the time and place for me to get involved in a discussion about the pros and cons of France's possession of this new weapon. I just want to say quite categorically on behalf of my group that this matter — which without doubt is of vital importance — is equally without doubt outside the competence of this Parliament. Once again, as the House is about to start a debate and possibly move on to votes on military or strategic matters, I want to point out that this Parliament has no competence in this area and that there could be serious repercussions for the future development of Europe, if this House insists on discussing matters which have nothing to do with it.

**President.** — I call Mr d'Ormesson to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

**Mr d'Ormesson.** — (F) Mr President, the Group of the European People's Party calls on this Assembly to vote against urgent procedure. The fact is that this request is incompatible with the letter of the Treaty of Rome, and even more so the spirit of the Treaty, because the European Community was set up to safeguard freedom for all of us, and there can be no freedom unless we have the means to defend it. It is for this reason that the European People's Party wants this motion referred to committee and a rapporteur appointed. We shall not stand in the way of a debate thereafter, because we have nothing to fear. It was Pericles who said that there can be no happiness without freedom and no freedom without courage. I ask the authors of this motion to think about that.

**President.** — I call Mr Galland to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Galland.** — (F) Mr President, the Liberal and Democratic Group firmly requests Parliament to vote against this motion for urgency.

There are several reasons. You may want to get on with things, Mr Seal. But until there is any evidence to the contrary, this is a defence matter and we have absolutely no competence in this area. We might like to see some progress on this matter, but as things stand we certainly cannot interfere in a Member State's policies on weapons and strategic defence.

## Galland

Secondly, we might like to adopt a neutral stance but the imbalance in tactical and strategic weapons between East and West leads us to think that the authors of this motion, in their quest for peace at any price, have unhappily taken an unrealistic and indeed irresponsible approach.

Thirdly, is there any call for urgency? Of course not. This is something which one of the Member States started a long time ago and which is going to take several years yet, and which — I repeat — as things are at the moment has nothing to do with this Parliament.

Finally, Mr President, let me say here and now that this request shows once again how important it is to change the Rules of Procedure on urgency when we come to vote on the Luster report this afternoon. If this report had been adopted, we should be able to avoid all this excessive behaviour and the waste of time caused by certain political groups or factions within them.

**President.** — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

The request is rejected.

The motion for a resolution will therefore be referred to the appropriate committee.

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider *the motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-308/80) by Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg and others: Law of the Sea.*

I call Mr Herman to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

**Mr Herman.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, there is no need for a long speech to justify urgency. The Geneva Conference is scheduled to take place in August. The Conference is to take a final decision on the European Community's authority to sign the Convention. We shall not be meeting again until September. We must decide now.

**President.** — I call Mr Walter.

**Mr Walter.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am not at all happy that Mr Herman has spoken out in favour of urgency on behalf of the Christian-Democratic Group. Mr Herman is a

member of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and he is well aware that we are already working on a report on this subject in the committee. I myself am the rapporteur. At the beginning of the week we agreed on the sound principle that while discussion continued at the committee stage we should not table any motions for urgency in the House. That is the first reason why I and the rest of the Socialist Group are against urgency. There is also a second reason. The second Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea, which is to take place in July and August this year, is put forward as justification for urgency. I would point out that in February or March this year, following a report by the Legal Affairs Committee on this Conference on the Law of the Sea, Parliament adopted a comprehensive position on this matter. I would also say that, even if we go into this matter today, we can no longer influence the outcome of the Geneva Conference because negotiations have progressed to such a stage that there is essentially very little that can be changed. There is only one reason why Parliament should consider the Conference on the Law of the Sea again in the autumn, and that is to examine its economic repercussions on the European Community. The Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has already planned a report on this aspect, ladies and gentlemen, and I am the rapporteur. I am therefore against urgency.

**President.** — I call Mr Calvez to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Calvez.** — (F) Mr President, our group has a series of criticisms to make with regard to this motion. It is quite wrong to suggest there is any lack of intra-Community cooperation at the Conference on the Law of the Sea. Everyone knows that the Member States have been meeting three or four times a week.

I do not want to go on for a long time but there are also some inaccuracies with regard to sovereignty and scientific research. I think this would be a political error just before what could in fact be a decisive meeting for this Conference on the Law of the Sea. Europe has to make an effort to reconcile the views of the Third World and the developed countries, and there is no doubt that Europe has an important role to play between the Third World and the industrialized nations.

We have to insist of course that Europe has a place at the conference table but this motion is far too technical. It would be fine with one or two alterations but we are not going to adopt it as it is.

**President.** — I call Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg.

**Mr Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I realize that the House is

**Sayn-Wittgenstein-Berleburg**

being snowed under with requests for urgency. As for this motion — which the last speaker commented on, and incorrectly in my view — our group would not have tabled it if the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea had not been meeting at the end of this month and beginning of August and for the first time reaching some final decisions. You know how difficult it is to change a resolution once it has been formally adopted.

What our group feels is that there should be a last-ditch attempt, as it were, to ensure that the Community gets the right to play a genuine part in the proceedings. This has not been the case until now. And I do not share the view that what has been done so far has been coordinated. It has been a series of individual moves. The whole point of our group's view is that it is high time we actually adopted a Community approach and did what should have been done at some time over the last eight years. Nothing has been done. There has been the odd initiative now and then but they have all got bogged down. The upshot is that the Community is now going into this Conference on the Law of the Sea with nothing to show.

I urge you all to vote in favour of urgency since at the end of this month we have to be there in Geneva or at least let our opinion be known.

**President.** — I call Mr Moreland to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Moreland.** — Mr President, I would like to say that we accept the view of the Christian-Democratic Group that urgent procedure is needed because the session will take place shortly and will end before our Parliament's next part-session. There are certain points in the text with which we cannot totally agree and to some extent I go along with my colleague, Mr Calvez. We might put down amendments on this motion but obviously, given the purpose of this debate which is urgent procedure, we shall not be opposing this resolution.

**President.** — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

The request is rejected.

The motion for a resolution will therefore be referred to the appropriate committee.

##### *5. Proposals for total rejection of the 1980 budget*

**President.** — The next item is the presentation of two proposals for the total rejection of the general budget

of the European Communities for 1980 and the explanations of vote relating thereto.

I call Mr Balfe.

**Mr Balfe.** — Mr President, I am asking the House today to maintain the consistency which it spoke of and showed last December and to reject this budget, a budget which is bad for the workers of the EEC and is bad for workers beyond the EEC, a budget which, in spite of the tinkering since December, still offers no hope for the hungry in the world, little prospects for the jobless, a budget in which the social and regional programmes have been cut back from the inadequate levels which were put forward, a budget from which the coal and steel proposals have been deleted in financial terms and a budget in which agricultural expenditure rises whilst within it we have the obnoxious spectacle of speculation in commodities and also in agricultural policy, which provides inadequate rewards for the poorer and more marginal farmers of Europe.

What I would ask this House is how many people must die, how many must be unemployed, how many must live in poverty and unhappiness before this House will face up to its responsibilities towards the people of the EEC and towards the people beyond the EEC in the Third World, because what I would say to this House is this: unless you can construct a credible budget which offers hope within the EEC and beyond the EEC, you will have neither credibility nor a following. If people cannot get their just desires fulfilled by democratic institutions, then they will turn against them, because democracy is based on consent. This budget is a bad budget. It is a budget which comes nowhere near to fulfilling the limited aspirations which we in this Parliament set ourselves. This budget is not substantially different from the budget that we rejected in December and I challenge anyone to say that it is. What we will see today, because we have asked for a roll-call vote, is who cares enough to reject the budget, who cares enough to pass the budget and — the worst group of the lot — who cares so little that they have no opinion on the budget — those who are so concerned with being latter-day Neville Chamberlains, wandering round Europe with worthless bits of paper which they pretend are policy statements, that they are prepared to sacrifice in return for those pieces of paper the ideals which they profess so loudly. The people of the EEC and the people beyond the EEC deserve a better response from this Parliament and deserve a better budget. For the sake of consistency and all the claims that were made last December, I challenge this House that the only honest thing it can do is to maintain its position, to reject the 1980 budget, and thus strike a blow for the workers within the EEC and the world beyond.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Mr President, I agree that it would be extremely difficult for anybody to maintain that the budget which we have before us today is different in either essentials or details from the one which we rejected in December as an act of faith in Parliament's beliefs and as an important demonstration of political solidarity.

The reasons why we are now preparing to approve the budget, Mr President, have of course got nothing to do with the budget itself — they are considerations of another kind, considerations of political expediency, dictated, I believe, by those in this Assembly who still do not believe that in the Community this Parliament must make a role for itself which is not an extension of the day-to-day administration and the anti-European bureaucratic routine.

Apart from the growing imbalance, between obligatory and non-obligatory expenditure, it is very difficult to see anything new at all in this budget, as regards either its effect on economic convergence or the prospect of the rapid depletion of our own resources. This major imbalance has been maintained, even though it was in fact one of the reasons which led Parliament to reject the budget.

Apart from the points which Mr Balfe has already made, there is also the further increase in agricultural expenditure in absolute terms. I would even maintain that this expenditure does not help agriculture: expenditure of this nature has in fact turned out to be increasingly against the interests of European agriculture. It isn't by doctoring one or two facets of our economic structure that we will achieve a satisfactory situation. We keep on making massive investments in agriculture, and the crisis in European agriculture continues to grow. The more money you divert like this from a comprehensive renewal policy, the more the agricultural sector, which you claim you want to heal, will languish.

And then, Mr President, there are other points which seem to be to have a moral significance. How, when the Carter Administration is laying down the law — even if it has no legal force; how, when the Brandt report is about to be published; how, when last November we approved a resolution requesting the immediate appropriation of 0.7 % of our countries' GNP for the campaign against hunger in the world and for an aid programme; how can the European Communities now further reduce the ridiculously low sum paid so far? And yet, Mr President, there has been a lot of talk — including what Mr Thorn said — about the need to invest in new energy resources which will meet our new requirements. And here we realize we are the victims of a sort of con trick, with lip service being paid to the need to invest in alternative sources of renewable energy, so as to make it easier to slip through a policy of unqualified support for uranium and plutonium. This budget is typical of a corrupt Europe using massive investment and a torrent of

words to try and retain a certain way of life and a certain kind of policy which in fact push it nearer and nearer the precipice: in agriculture, in international affairs and now in energy.

That is why this Parliament's act of faith in itself, in its tradition as an elected Parliament, and not in the tradition of its predecessor which was no more than a bureaucratic, parasitic branch of the administration... That, Mr President, is why we hope that this budget will be rejected.

**President.** — I call Mr Glinne to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Glinne.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the 1980 budget, as drawn up at the Council meeting of 30 June following our extraordinary part-session in Luxembourg, is, in the opinion of the entire Socialist Group, extremely inadequate. This was already the case after the battle of amendments in Parliament on 26 and 27 June, since the amendments introduced by the Socialists were rejected; since, in spite of our support, the amendments proposed by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and the Committee on Development and Cooperation were not adopted; and, since, despite our support, certain appropriations and the inclusion of the European Development Fund and the loans in the budget, as proposed by the Committee on Budgets itself and on which a wide consensus had earlier on been achieved, were turned down by the plenary session. After the vote on the amendments by the majority of Parliament, to show our deep dissatisfaction, we had no choice but to vote against the motion for a resolution that went along with the budget. We did so, let me remind you, with only two abstentions.

The budget, in its present form after the Council meeting of 30 June, is worse than that of 27 June. We cannot in any way approve it.

However, in the present circumstances and given our timetable, the overwhelming majority of the Socialist Group considers it inexpedient to endorse the proposals for rejection before us. It is important for the Community finally to have a budget for 1980. Rejection would moreover imply an extension of the provisional twelfths from the 1979 budget which is considerably outdated and inadequate in several respects.

Our position will therefore be to abstain from voting. We feel that the procedure to be followed under the 1980 budget is now accomplished. Most members of our group expect the provisions of Article 203 to be implemented today. In our opinion, Parliament, in rejecting the budget in December 1979 — with our massive support, as I said — was trying to encourage a profound revamping of the budgetary structures and of Community policies, so as to introduce new poli-

Glinne

cies, and live up to the expectations of the peoples and voters of 10 June 1979. I must point out that as far as we are concerned, it was not a question of institutional squabbling.

Mr President, the underlying struggle will continue in the immediate future not only over the budgetary procedures for 1981, but also in the entire work of Parliament, I would, moreover, like to remind you that we are here, more specifically, to defend all European workers who also — and I am referring particularly to the statements of the European Trade Union Confederation — expect a profound change in the Community.

**President.** — I call Mr Langes to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group)

**Mr Langes.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the European People's Party gives its approval to the 1980 budget and consequently rejects the motions tabled by Mr Balfe and Mr Pannella and their comrades. The fact is that this draft budget, in its present form, incorporates substantial improvements in a number of areas in line with the demands expressed by this House when it rejected the original draft in November and December 1979. Since we essentially support the common agricultural policy, we welcome the fact that our proposals for an average price increase of 5 % have now been accepted. We agree with the 0.5 % increase in the co-responsibility levy to 2 %, and we realize that we shall have to discuss the question of surplus production again with the Council when we come to deal with the 1981 budget.

We recognize that a great step forward has been taken as regards regional policy, and that more modest successes have been achieved in the fields of social and energy policy. Of course we realize that not enough has been done, but this is after all a compromise which, we believe, justifies our decision to reject the budget in December 1979, but which also justifies us in approving the budget now so that Europe can start making progress again. Since you raised the question of logic, Mr Balfe, let me say that, of course, there is a very wide measure of agreement on logical precepts — ranging from Thomas Aquinas through Kant and Voltaire to your compatriot Karl Popper. The logic of your speech boils down to the fact that you are essentially against the European Community and are out to destroy it. If that is what you are really after, then please say so publicly in this House. That is surely the logical conclusion to be drawn from your arguments.

The fact is then, ladies and gentlemen, that our approval of the budget is bound up with a very clear demand on our part to the Council. Let me remind you of what the President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Thorn, said yesterday to the effect that structural

changes must form a part of the 1981 budget. It remains to be seen to what extent the President-in-Office can impose his authority in the Council as regards this matter. The real problem in Europe, as we in the European People's Party see it, is that, of the three pillars of the European Community — Commission, Parliament and Council — the Council is the biggest problem because — as we unfortunately see only too often the agriculture ministers decide something the finance ministers know nothing about, and the energy ministers come up with a demand which the finance ministers promptly reject. The precept from the Gospel that the right hand should not know what the left hand is doing is not applicable here. The Council — and this remark is addressed to Mr Thorn — should see itself as a European Institution and not as a summation of national interests or of specialist Councils.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is the real political issue, and that is why our thanks are due in particular to the outgoing President-in-Office of the Council, Mr Colombo, for showing that it is possible to re-establish unity in the Council by working in the true European spirit to get us out of the earlier deadlock in various Councils of Ministers. If the Council continues his good work, there is every chance of the 1981 budgetary procedure reaching a favourable conclusion.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Scott-Hopkins to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Scott-Hopkins.** — Mr President, I think very few of the Members of this House are completely satisfied with the outcome of our deliberations on the 1980 budget since December of last year. I think that most people have a feeling of unease. On behalf of my group, however, I have to say that we cannot go along with the rejection of the budget now, either on the grounds that Mr Balfe has put forward or on the grounds that Mr Pannella has put forward. It is true that the underlying problems which caused the rejection of the budget in December of last year are still there. Of course they are. Nobody would deny it. But at least there has been some advance, as we have just heard from Mr Langes. But I give fair warning to the Ministers and to the Commission that the promises which have been made to us in regard to changing the structure of the common agricultural policy, changing the balance of the budget between agriculture and energy, regional and social policy, those promises must be fulfilled. During the debates later on this year, we must see the first steps along that road. We know full well that nothing can be done immediately. It will not happen within a few weeks. But, unless we see some proof during the coming months and when we start debating the 1981 budget, then we shall not only be very disappointed men and women, but we shall

**Scott-Hopkins**

never again trust the word of either Council or Commission. Indeed, a solemn pledge was given by Ministers at the meeting of 30 May in Brussels that they would consider how to effect these changes. And so we look to them to do so. That is why, Mr President, my group cannot support this motion for rejection.

But as I said, there is a very great deal to do in this field. We, as the joint budgetary authority, are not just here as a rubber stamp for the Council, or indeed for the Commission. We wish to partake in those decisions which determine the expenditure which this House is asked to authorize at a later stage. And I give notice to both Council and Commission that this House will increasingly ask to be participants and joint participants in the formulation of policy which leads to the expenditure of money. And so, Mr President, with a certain amount of unease, my honourable friends and I will vote against the motions which are down on the order paper to reject this budget.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Baillot.

**Mr Baillot.** — *(F)* Mr President, there was a long debate in Luxembourg on whether or not Parliament should vote on the budget. The majority, shirking its responsibility, refused to vote on it under the pretext that there would be another opportunity here in Strasbourg. If, however, we did not today have to examine two motions submitted by some of our colleagues, Parliament would not have to vote on the 1980 budget at all. There is something profoundly disturbing in such a situation which does not add to the laurels of this House. Despite that, for the one year it has been sitting, from the Socialist Group to the Liberals via the Christian Democrats and the Conservatives, everyone has been asking for an increase in its powers. What a beautiful opportunity the budget offers, but you turn it down! We, the French Members of the Communist and Allies Group, intend to reaffirm our opposition to the budget, which the Council had no problems accepting, since it was so similar to the one previously submitted to us. As for the two motions before us, we intend to abstain. Explicitly in one case, implicitly in the other, since the share of the budget earmarked for agriculture is given as the reason for the insufficient appropriations set aside for workers. We cannot accept a view, even if we think the social policy of the Community is extremely inadequate as my friend René Piquet said yesterday. In any case, all these issues will be raised again in a few weeks with the 1981 budget and we will, once more, state our position.

**President.** — I call Mrs Scrivener to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mrs Scrivener.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Liberal and Democratic Group will be voting against the motions for the rejection of the budget, and I would like to briefly explain why we today accept a budget rejected by Parliament last December. In outline, I intend to mention three factors that have changed over the last six months. Firstly, there are the relations between Parliament and the Council. Real progress has been made in this area. The Council is now prepared to engage in a dialogue which it had too often avoided in the past, since Parliament was considered somewhat as the poor relation in the budgetary authority. Recent discussions have provided proof of changes in the right direction.

Secondly, let me mention agriculture. Without trying to question the basic principles of the common agricultural policy, I think that, over the last six months, everyone has become aware of the need to adapt it to today's realities. The question of sectors with structural surpluses was practically a forbidden topic last year. From now on, no one can deny the efforts that have to be made in this sector. The Council of Ministers echoed this concern by taking the well-known decisions in the dairy sector. It cannot be denied that we are witnessing a genuine change in attitudes, on this subject.

Lastly, Mr President, I would conclude by referring to the question of non-obligatory expenditure. The Council has accepted the eleven million supplementary units of account that we inserted. Let no one be misled. This extremely modest amount is not going to make any great change in the budget. Ours was a political move to show the high priority Parliament accorded to certain sectors which until now were inadequately endowed. The four million set aside for energy policy is proof of this desire.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Liberal and Democratic Group consequently approves this draft budget for 1980, but would like to make it clear that those points that I have just dwelt upon must be considered only as the beginning of the process of improvement. Considerable progress still has to be made; let us not deceive ourselves, because now all our efforts have to be turned towards the 1981 budget, the preliminary draft of which will be submitted to us tomorrow by the Commission.

**President.** — I call Mr Ansquer to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mr Ansquer.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, one idea comes to the mind of all observers who have been following the proceedings of this House since its election by universal suffrage. The idea is that Parliament has fully exercised its budgetary powers. Some Members are asking for greater scope and more powers. With regard to the budget, I must say that Parliament certainly has exercised its powers.



**Ansquer**

As to whether Parliament was right to reject the budget, I will not pass any judgment. It will be left to the history of the Community to decide whether we were right, to reject the first Community budget so soon after our election by universal suffrage.

On the other hand, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, our stand is clear. We wanted a vote and this is going to take place; so we have obtained some satisfaction already. We feel that the Assembly must, once more, state its opinion as it did in rejecting the budget last December.

Lastly, with regard to the main issues, namely that of incorporating the policies into the Community budget, we voted in favour of the budget in December and will do so again. However, we did not accept the proposal of our rapporteur, Mr Dankert, because we felt and still feel that it may lead to disunity in the Community over the common agricultural policy and financial solidarity. The common agricultural policy is the only common policy founded on basic principles. That is why, in our opinion, it must continue to be one of the pillars of European constructions even if it has to be amended or improved upon.

We are also asking, however, for a bold trade policy to be established within the Community so as to avoid any disorder or mistakes. Above all, we would like to see new policies introduced using adequate own resources, so that our Community could thus continue to play the role we have a right to expect of Europe in the major problems facing it and the world at large.

**President.** — I call Mr Bonde.

**Mr Bonde.** — (DK) Mr President, the members of the People's Movement against the EEC will not give their support to the budget for 1980. Why should we, since the Council of Ministers has shown that it is more than willing to adopt anything whatsoever? I should like to congratulate the Council of Ministers not on getting a new budget, since it has had one already all the time the provisional twelfths have been in force, but for scoring a hat-trick of own goals.

This started in December, when at least from a Danish point of view, they seemed prepared to grant Parliament 100 million u. a. for Parliament's non-obligatory expenditure. In a different room, at 5 o'clock in the morning and in a foreign language this amount was doubled following a threat to reject the Community budget. The budget was in fact rejected, and three weeks ago yesterday we got our reward in the form of an increase from 200 to 240 million u. a. However, this was the Council's final offer and was on condition that Parliament adopted the draft budget in a single reading. What did Parliament in fact do? It started involving itself in the obligatory expenditure, although it was not supposed to do this, and the non-obligatory

expenditure was increased once more from 240 to 251 million u. a. Thus the Council scored three own goals. These were three unnecessary concessions to Parliament which will not give up the fight over the Community budget until it gains control over the last pennies of the taxpayers' money.

Every single piece of paper in the Committee on Budgets and in this Parliament concerns the constitution of Denmark and the other Member States. They concern the extent to which it should be this assembly, in which 16 of the 410 members represent Denmark and Greenland, which should make decisions, or whether they should be made in a Parliament which we ourselves are able to elect. This is an important issue here, even if the actual amounts involved are sometimes peanuts.

Looking back at what has happened on this occasion. I should like to urge the Council of Ministers to take a firm stand when we come to discuss the 1981 budget, since if it does not do so once and for all, and if Parliament is not taught a lesson once and for all, the 1981 budget will be rejected, and so will the 1982 budget and the 1983 budget, and we will repeatedly be without a budget to work with for six months at a time.

**President.** — I call Mr Spinelli.

**Mr Spinelli.** — (I) Mr President, the budget which the Council is offering to us for a second reading today is a slightly worse version of the budget we sent back to them a month ago. A month ago we Italian Members of the Communist and Allies Group made very plain our opposition, and the reasons for our opposition, to that budget, and so there is no point in my going into them in detail again.

I will simply say that this budget, as put to us by the Council, fails to meet the Community's needs and the demands made by this House last December for fundamental changes in the structure of the budget and of Community policies. The only reply we had from the Council was 'no' and a few crumbs thrown under the table. I must say how very sorry I am to hear Mr Langes and Mrs Scrivener more or less unashamedly saying thank you for those crumbs after helping us with the fight to get a new budget. At least Mr Scott-Hopkins has had the courage to admit that even if he votes against rejection he will vote *with unease*. And you say that you are satisfied! How can you be? And then tomorrow Mr Tugendhat will present the 1981 budget to you saying that he is dancing to the Council's tune: that budget will be even worse because nothing will have been changed. Under circumstances such as these we would not wish to bring up the big gun of rejection, a procedure which we cannot easily use lightheartedly, and so, along with the Socialist Group, we shall not be taking part in the vote. But let

**Spinelli**

there be no doubt about it: we do not support this budget!

*(Applause from the left)*

**President.** — I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — Unlike previous speakers, Mr Pannella and Mr Bonde on behalf of my group I support the budget, not because I particularly like it but because I think that we have already done a disservice to the Community over these last seven or eight months and that we should, despite the objections, have accepted our budget back in December. I regard the passage of time since then as an overall attack on the common agricultural policy and I listen with interest to those who today say they will approve this budget but give due warning that they want restructuring in agriculture and in the common agricultural policy. I agree with restructuring, but not the type of restructuring that is intended and is being foisted upon us by the speakers and groups whom we have already heard here today.

Regional policy does not exist to any great extent. The amount of money provided is much too low, the non-quota section is ridiculously low and, until that has been moved up very substantially, we cannot even begin to apply a regional policy that will have any meaning, the meaning which we intend, which is to try to level up the regions that are not so well off to the level of the better off.

I should say finally in regard to the common agricultural policy that I totally and absolutely reject and object to the system whereby agricultural goods are imported into the Community, creating artificial surpluses which are then laid at the door of the agricultural community within the Community and counted against the agricultural policy. I think this is totally wrong and the sooner we get to grips with the idea that multinationals can manipulate the market for their benefit under the pretext of being concerned about common agricultural policy and calling for restructuring, the sooner we recognize that and take the necessary action, the better it will be.

**President.** — I call Mr Romualdi.

**Mr Romualdi.** — *(I)* Mr President, we have heard it said often enough during the last few days that we must never again have a budget whose sole purpose is to ensure the continued existence and fulfilment of the traditional, bureaucratic commitments of a Community which should instead have available a budget whose flexibility and scope allow it to develop our common policy in the most dynamic way possible.

As we have frequently stated, we agree entirely. But as we have also already stated, at this point it would be pointless and dangerous to continue a trial of strength

with the Council, with a Council which is clearly incapable, at least at the moment, of overcoming the problems — particularly the political, but also the technical problems — which prevent us from raising the ceiling of our own resources, which is the only real way, the only means by which we shall see any real expansion and development in common policy.

That is the reason, the only reason, why during the last few days we have voted in favour of the budget which the Council has now brought back to us, after accepting it with only a few formal comments of no great significance.

For those same reasons we shall vote against the rejection motions tabled by the socialists and the radicals: firstly because in our view it would not even be admissible in the absence of the important reasons required by Article 203 (8) of the Treaty.

And secondly, especially, because the motions for rejection, although they may not look like it, at this particular time constitute no more than an attempt to score a few demagogic, propaganda points, an attempt which is as noisy as it is ineffectual. Those, ladies and gentlemen, are things which Europe can do without at this moment, at least from us, from this European Parliament.

**President.** — I call Mr Tugendhat.

**Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, I have listened carefully to the advocates of rejection and also to the spokesmen of the various political groups who have spoken today. I think perhaps one does not need to go any further than the letter B in the alphabet in order to appreciate the range and diversity of views to be found in this Parliament. If one compares the speeches of Mr Balfe, Mr Bonde and Mr Blaney, one does, I think, cover the whole spectrum of views to be found on the benches in this hemicycle.

I, however, would go back to the beginning of the alphabet and take up a point made by Mr Ansquer. Without going into all the points that he made, I would certainly agree with him that the European Parliament has shown in its first year of existence that it is prepared and able to exercise to the full its budgetary rights. There can be no doubt at all about that. Equally, I think, there can be no doubt now, in July of 1980, that the Community needs a budget for 1980. By definition, the *douzième provisoire* — the provisional twelfth system — is a provisional system. If the Community is obliged to live without a budget for an indefinite period, then there is no doubt at all that very considerable difficulties would arise in the execution of the existing policies. What has already been created and built up would be threatened, and it would be extremely difficult in those circumstances to begin to bring about the changes the desire for which has been

**Tugendhat**

expressed in so many quarters of this House today. As Mr Glinne said, speaking on behalf of the Socialist Group at the beginning, the interests of the Community are against the rejection of this budget.

I would agree with him and indeed with other speakers from all parties who have said that this budget, as it stands, is not ideal. Indeed, this budget, as it stands, differs very significantly, very substantially, from the original preliminary draft budget which the Commission produced twelve months ago. We certainly regret very much that some actions by the Council — and some inaction by the Council — have prevented the evolution of a draft budget, and ultimately a budget, that would bear a closer relationship to the ideas which we originally produced and some of the ideas which have been put forward in Parliament than is in fact the case today. I hope very much that the Council will listen very carefully to the points made by Mr Langes, speaking on behalf of the European People's Party, and also by Mr Scott-Hopkins, speaking on behalf of the European Democratic Group, when they drew the attention of the Council to the need for far-reaching changes in the balance and the organization of some of the Community's policies.

That, Mr President, brings me to my final point, which is this. Do not let us continuously harp on the inadequacies of the present. Let us also sometimes take some encouragement from the progress that has been made and the progress that is being made. Many of the ideas discussed in this Parliament during the latter part of last year have now entered into the mainstream of Community thought. Many of the ideas which were being put forward here, and which at the time did not always receive an echo in the Council or in the European Council, are now very much in the mainstream of the speeches being made and the ideas being put forward by heads of government themselves. That has, of course, led to the mandate of the Commission to examine and enquire into the whole balance of Community policies within the budget. This is a mandate, as I have said to the House before, which we take extremely seriously. It must be thorough, it must be far-reaching, it must be ambitious, and certainly we must complete it in the time allotted, in other words, in less than a year's time from now. And I hope very much that all members of the Council will heed very seriously the words of the German Chancellor about the need for the consequential reforms to follow quickly after our proposals have been put forward.

As Mrs Scrivener said in her speech, on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, no one now denies the need for changes and improvements in the common agricultural policy. We must bring them about in order to safeguard and to develop that policy, in order to protect and preserve it and, of course, in order to enable other policies to grow up in the Community as well. On all sides of the House there has certainly been unease — to put it no higher — at the failure of the Community to widen its scope, to widen its area of

activity. Some people have spoken of regional policy, some have spoken of social policy, some have spoken of trade policy, but the need for the Community to move forward on a wider and broader front is something which I think unites not quite everybody but almost everybody in this House. It is certainly a point of view to which the Commission can subscribe. I believe that the mandate we have been asked to carry out will fulfil the hopes which have been expressed on all sides in this House and that within a year from now we will be talking about the possibility, about the potentiality, of far-reaching and important developments within our Community.

I hope therefore, Mr President that the House will adopt the budget in the vote this afternoon.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — The debate is closed. The proposals for the total rejection of the 1980 budget will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

**6. Agenda**

**President.** — At the request of the rapporteurs, I propose that Parliament hold a joint debate on the reports by Mr von Wogau (Docs. 1-236/80 and 1-141/80) and Mr de Ferranti (Doc. 1-224/80) on technical barriers to trade which are on the agenda for tomorrow's sitting.

Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

**7. Economic development of the Community in the first half of 1980**

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-288/80), drawn up by Mr von Bismarck on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on

the economic development of the Community in the first half of 1980 and the implementation of the Council's decision on convergence.

I call Mr von Bismarck.

**Mr von Bismarck, rapporteur** — *(D)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, these last few days, a great European statesman has been visiting his mother's children who, after a thousand years of enmity, are now his friends, and what he had to say to them was that their European mother should at last get round to playing her rightful role — or, as he might have said, learning to play her rightful role. But before Mother

## von Bismarck

Europe can comply with his wishes, we must all make our rightful contribution, and that includes the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. That is the background to this report, which is firmly based on the Council Decisions and Directive of 18 February 1974, which form the 'Basic Law' of our European market economy.

I should like to suggest, Mr President, that these two basic documents, the Council's decisions and directive, should be handed round to all the Members of this House — if possible in the course of this debate — so that everyone knows what is the 'Basic Law' of Parliament as regards economic policy. Otherwise, how are we to know what we are really talking about here? How are we to come to a decision if we are not even acquainted with our own 'Basic Law'? Article 1 sets out the aims, which are price stability, external economic equilibrium, growth and full employment. In fact, this last aim, full employment, is the main thing, and all the others are merely means to this end.

Articles 2 to 11 go on to describe the means which, if we were really to apply them, would get us a good deal further. Why do we need these means? The answer is because Europe has two main enemies — the first of them narrow, foolish, obstinate, vain and self-seeking nationalism, and the second rather more important — the ignorance of all our people about what goes on here and what must be done in Europe to achieve these goals. The fault here lies not with the people, but with the politicians — which, ladies and gentlemen, includes this House. There is widespread ignorance of how these things hang together; without this, we should have beaten inflation long ago, and I think these two enemies — narrow-minded, vain and self-seeking nationalism on the one hand and widespread ignorance on the other — make it incumbent upon all of us — Commission, Council and Parliament — to join together in the common cause.

This is, of course, a matter in particular for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, because we are reputed to have a certain amount of specialist knowledge at our disposal. Despite this, however, — we are constantly confronted with the two enemies I mentioned earlier — nationalism and ignorance. The report you now have before you contains only two basic statements. The first of these — and I cannot lay claim to this very good invention, since it is the brain child of Mr Macario — is that we have been and still are living beyond our means. In other words, we have consumed more than we have produced, and it is time we made better use of those resources we have and which were created by the Council itself. We must take our own principles more seriously. The report does not discuss in detail the ways in which we have been living beyond our means, but page 5 sets out all the serious consequences of our recklessness, ranging from inflation to disequilibrium in our balance of trade and from unemployment to the inadequate elimination of regional differences. This is

all due to the fact that, in our Member States, we still allow ourselves the luxury of inflation rates which make our aims unattainable. That is why price stability is the first aim of the Council Decision.

The second basic point in the report refers to the reporting in December.

We must make use of the instruments we ourselves created. Our esteemed colleague Mr Jean Rey, who is now leaving us and who deserves our utmost respect, said yesterday that Europe now needs to be ruled rather than negotiated, and it is indeed true that, if we fail to govern ourselves, it is no wonder that the consequences are as they are. Let me repeat — with the utmost possible urgency — what I said last time. Without centralized guidance, without government, none of our aims is attainable. And so long as we have no government, the decisive factor is the quality of cooperation between Parliament, the Commission and the Council. I accept — it was hard for me, but I do now accept it — that the Commission cannot say everything which we can in public. It therefore deserves praise for what it does not say in public. It should have been praised for its report last time, which really said everything. What is more important, though, is that we should realize that, without saying so in public, the Commission is trying to push the Member States' governments along the lines of the 'Basic Law' which they themselves created. Ladies and gentlemen, the Commission deserves our support in spelling out the facts so that, little by little, they will become common knowledge, and we should encourage the Commission to tell us not to live beyond our means, whether it be on the wages front or on the political front. The wages front counts for 70 %, the political front — in other words, the state — accounts for 45 %. No matter how virtuous we are, we cannot possibly make up for the sins committed there. He who consumes more than he has must simply work more. But to work less and consume the same amount likewise amounts to living beyond one's means. If we want to help the developing countries, we cannot consume more if we are not prepared to work more.

Ladies and gentlemen, we too — if we want to help the Council and the Commission — must fight the good fight against nationalism. We must fight against vanity, selfishness and posturing in this House. Unfortunately I cannot name names. However, we have received a direct mandate from our 260 million voters. It is our duty to call upon the Council to do what it itself promised, and it is our duty to support the Commission when it does what is necessary. It is duty to create a certain room for manoeuvre in the Member States' governments and in the Council by spelling out the facts which the Commission cannot do so openly. I also think it is our duty to support those governments which — and I am thinking here particularly of three major European countries — are fully committed, even at great risk, to the fight for stability, and to tell them that they are on the right track and that the

von Bismarck

European Parliament is behind them all the way. That is something we owe to our voters. Our Mother Europe demands of us that we should from time to time bang her children's heads together if they do not behave themselves. That too is something our people expect of us.

We too are committed by what the statesman is now saying to his brothers and sisters in other European countries. Only if we enable Europe to maintain a healthy balance and to act — in other words, if we stop living beyond our means and prove capable of governing Europe — will Europe be able to play its rightful role and fulfil the hopes which are pinned on Europe whether — and note my words — it be from North, South or West or from the very heart of Europe.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Delors to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Delors.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the Socialist Group shares the rapporteur's justified impatience at the Community's lack of progress and at its inability to make a united and coherent response to the economic challenges of our age. However, in my opinion, we cannot achieve our common aim by taking reckless measures or by referring to past resolutions which were never applied. We politicians, in the light of the radical transformation Europe is undergoing, should be prepared to admit at some point that we are not omniscient. I myself, and many others have been confused by recent events. This is the third debate we have had on the economic situation in a year. In my opinion, and I take upon myself, that is two too many. Because in each of our discussions we ask the Commissions to submit reports. One report a month, one report for the Council, one for the Parliament, one for the European Council and many others... all of these papers cannot contain flashes of genius. This being so, we get bogged down in ideological conflicts and in oversimplified ideas which cannot reflect the complex and sometimes bewildering truth of the present situation.

This is why what should be normal cooperation between the Council, the Commission and the Parliament has taken on the form of reprimands and mutual accusations, when what is needed is for us to work together to strive to find a solution, for us to tone down our own opinions and try to make gradual progress in that evolution of our society and our economy which, I repeat, is the real challenge facing the men and women of our generation.

This is why I am forced to admit that several of the debates in this Parliament seem unreal to me. And even as I speak, I cannot shake off a two-fold feeling

of irritation and disquiet, feelings which are shared by my fellow members in the Socialist Group and it is for these reasons that we shall vote against this report.

First of all why are we irritated? How simple everything would be if only we could sum up the difficulties Europe is experiencing today by laying the blame on two scapegoats. On the one hand, inflation, on the other the Council of Ministers.

First let us look at inflation and the underlying simplistic notion that we Europeans are living beyond our means. But who exactly is living beyond his means? Is the Welsh steel worker whose standard of living and job are threatened, living beyond his means? Are the farmers in the south of Europe — who were told by experts in agriculture that they must modernize even if this meant getting in to debt, and who now cannot keep up their standard of living — living beyond their means? Who is living beyond his means? Is it the oil companies who buy oil, store it and wait for the next price rise to guarantee them windfall profit?

Who makes the profit? Who is living beyond his means? Is it the speculator who last year invested in gold, property and other 'hedges', even though the money supply was already being squeezed, a point to which I will come back later? Whose fault is it if the world was gripped by money madness before inflation really struck in 1979, just as it was in 1974, can we accuse the ordinary worker who has taken for granted that his purchasing power will remain the same or even be reduced, or should we not accuse our economies which have all been thrown badly out of balance? It is not enough just to place the blame on inflation and link this to the notion that we are living beyond our means in order to solve such a difficult problem. Because when we talk of living beyond our means, this also involves keeping 6 to 7 % of Europeans out of the productive cycle, men and women who if they were at work instead of being on the dole, would increase production and make it easier to pay our oil bills.

I have given these examples not because I am seized by an overriding desire to be argumentative or dogmatic, but rather to highlight the fact that our present situation requires a more searching analysis than the one we have before us today. If Parliament indulges in swapping slogans or oversimplifying the problems then this is an admission of defeat by its Members in the face of such an extremely difficult situation. We are then tempted into a second course of action, that of waging inter-institutional guerilla warfare with the Council and the Commission, both of which are doing what they can and are a reflection far more of the self-contradictory nature of today's situation of the effects of conflicts between our countries, than of any human inability to solve the problems.

If only we were willing to admit that this is true, we would be able to establish together constructive coop-

## Delors

eration between the Council, the Commission and Parliament and its committees, and discover the path towards more effective economic and social cooperation between European countries.

We should not think of the Council of Ministers as some sort of 'Asterix'. It has no magic potion. Parliament can help the Council by becoming a real source of initiative. It could even give the Council a strong impetus to overcome some of its internal differences. But Parliament cannot possibly transform a difficult situation into a harmonized heaven. Here is an example: if there are such wide disparities between rates of inflation, this is not because the Council has not applied its Decision of 18 February 1974 on convergence, but — to be frank — because certain countries have 'messed about' or have not got down to dealing with their structural deficiencies. I know that Mr von Bismarck has tender memories of a law which brought excellent results in Germany — the law on growth and stability. But, Mr von Bismarck, this law was applied in one individual country which was able to do so because there was a consensus between the two sides of industry. So we cannot expect a similar document to produce the same results within a Europe whose identity is as yet only in its infancy.

Let me give you an example of one of these ideas which are too simplistic to be realistic and effective. Does not monetarist theory give credence to the notion of some invisible force. The thinking behind this notion is simple. Society has no discipline and private individuals are too demanding: there is no way to making them see reason. So, there has to be an invisible force — controlling the money supply — which will exert outside pressure on them to become more reasonable. Then Britain will stop losing its industries, and new firms will spring up. Do you not think that what we need is a series of measures and incentives which are more subtle than this?

So, with your permission, I shall be less ambitious and make a few proposals which I hope rule out any reckless adventurism. The European Parliament must not become some operatic chorus, good only for singing Wagnerian-style battle hymns within its own cramped space. If it does, then Europe cannot expect to progress, but only to vegetate. In my opinion in order to establish a dialogue between us, and we Socialists do not claim to have a monopoly of truth, then we must look at both sides of the problem facing us today:

Firstly, how can we guide our economies in an uncertain world in which not all the economic parameters are completely under our control? Secondly, and because economics must now be placed in a world context which is one of drastic change, how can Europe assume the international economic responsibilities which are hers today?

So firstly, how can we guide our economies in this uncertain world? It is quite wrong to say that infla-

tion has only one cause. I myself see three sets of causes. There is the rise in energy prices, which can mean a direct increase of 2 to 3 percentage points, depending on the country, in the consumer price index. Then there was that inflation madness which struck us in 1979 before it needed to, just as it had in 1974. And I must reiterate that monetarist medicine was already being administered last year. The money supply was tightly controlled, budgets were restricted. And yet, during the whole of this period, gold was on the upturn, 'hedgies' were much sought after, and inflation shot up. No government can today truthfully say that the rise in energy prices explains everything. The Western world last year experienced the same sort of mad desire for expansion which we had in 1974, because we were unable to control the mechanisms of our economies. Believe me when I say that I have not the courage to go and explain to a worker whose job and income are threatened the intricate details of monetarist policy, when bad examples are being set by the major banks who finance speculation, by the oil companies and by all types of speculator. If only the latter could be brought to heel, and those who hold the reins of economic and financial power all did their duty, then we could easily ask the other sectors of society to make their contribution to the common effort.

Lastly, there are structural causes of inflation. Nobody is ever prepared to admit this. However, over the last thirty years we have many times had experience of it. We have always tried to combat inflation using only a rational approach. This bought about a temporary drop in the economic temperature, and then inflation took off again once business picked up. The structural causes of inflation are well known. Sometimes they are restricted to particular countries. And whenever this is the case, those countries should set their own house in order. But others are common to all countries: market inefficiency, regional inequality, lack of a strong policy on employment and the dearth of risk capital... these structural causes must be dealt with too. What can a forced recession do to help in the fight against the inflationary spiral, and how much can it do and at what price? This is the question we must ask. And when I read in the press how pleased certain important people are — although this is not true for the rapporteur — to observe that 'production indices are on the downturn and this is a good sign', then I am forced to think of the doctor in one of Molière's plays, who always prescribed the same medicine: 'bleed him' he used to say. And they bled him so much that the poor man was unable to get out of bed!

Is this what we want to see happening to Europe? Do we want to see Europe bled white? Who then will face up to the challenge from Japan, to new competitors, to the new industrial revolution, who will make up the ground we have undoubtedly lost in energy planning? Will Europe be bled until companies no longer want to invest? Until unemployment demoralizes people and becomes the cancer in the breast of our society, taking

## Delors

away our desire to work and to create? Do we want to see a Europe with this sort of morale? Of course, a slowdown in economic activity was necessary in order to 'calm things down'. But now the cost of this policy is becoming too great. On this subject I should like to remind this House that the document which the Commission put before us last November was quite clear on this point. It said quite bluntly, 'we were reckless in 1979. We must now make up for our mistakes'. But we must be careful, because there comes a time when a slow-down in business becomes a danger not only for the present but also for the future, because it discourages companies from investing. It also tends to induce a gloomy climate in public opinion and in the business world. Well, now is the time to act and I am not alone in saying this. If I interpret the newspaper articles and the statements made both by Chancellor Schmidt and by the French Prime Minister Raymond Barre properly, then I note that they too are thinking in terms of stimulating the economy, because they are worried that economic stagnation might stifle initiative and willpower, robbing people of their energy and their determination to face the challenges now looming ahead. If we lived in a peaceful world with no great changes, there might well be some justification for a total purge of the economy, but it cannot be justified in such a tumultuous period of history. Whenever the purge is carried too far, our steel industry finds it more difficult to become competitive again. Our textile industry has to struggle harder to reorganize and break into the sectors which have a real future. This also means that no real innovation takes place. That there are more and more unemployed, which leads to non-productive expenditure, while such people would be better off working. The time has now come to envisage some supporting measures, without at the same time feeding the inflationary fire.

As I see it, these measures should follow three main lines. First of all that of more vigorous structural intervention. This should be based mainly on energy policy, energy saving, investment in new energy sources, and it should also apply to industry. We should provide more aid to sectors which are undergoing modernization and are under threat from international competition, and we should also not hesitate to launch one or two model Community projects in the sectors with a real future. In the realm of new data technology, it would be a great achievement if the Community could overcome the conflicts of interest between public authorities and countries and demonstrate that it is determined to progress, and to remain not only a giant in business terms but also in economic terms. It is essential that we regain this dynamism. How can we possibly imagine Europe carrying out effective political cooperation as a force for peace in the world if at the same time it is losing ground economically and commercially?

The second line to be followed — and this has already been discussed here — is that of Community loans. The best way to guarantee a minimal level of activity

in Europe is for the Community to float a large Community loan in ECUs which would help to support economic activity by financing some of the deficit caused by the rise in oil prices. This loan would under no circumstances help countries which are ailing or which apply bad economic policies. But I am sure I do not need to remind you that 50 % of the Member States' foreign trade is with other Community countries and that, if I may paraphrase a famous saying, 'one man's imports are another man's exports'. If this slump continues, we will come to resemble a group of nine castaways, each of whom depends upon the other to find some way out of the situation. What a pitiful image the Community would have in this event. Were we to float a Community loan, this would reinforce our solidarity not just economically and financially but symbolically and in a rational way. At the same time, this loan would enable us to impose a semblance of order on the international capital market. Lastly, we should join in implementing some basic solidarity projects. Not everyone is equally affected by this crisis — as I am sure I have no need to remind you. There are those who suffer more acutely, the worse-off sectors of society. What is Europe doing for them? What impact do the derisory resources of the Social Fund have when offset against their hardship? What is Europe doing to try to combat unemployment? A report from the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment will shortly be put before us — not before time — on the subject of reorganizing working hours; our Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs has already discussed this matter and I was pleased to note that we unanimously agreed that working hours should be reorganized, that they should be reduced to a reasonable extent in order to create new jobs. This is another sign of solidarity. On other matters, I am tempted to say to each country, Europe helps those who help themselves. For in spite of the resolutions of 1974 and 1978, no one in the Community has the power to help a country which helped sow the seeds of its own difficulties.

I now come to my second set of proposals, on Europe's economic responsibilities in the international field. There are three major dangers which are inextricably linked. Firstly, there is the financial and monetary disorder which prevails in the world, and on this subject I should like to stress how disappointed I and many others were by Venice II. Then there is the collapse of the countries of the Third World which are already deep in debt, and here again we cannot expect any miraculous solution from the United Nations Conference in August. We need to act now. Lastly, there is the general atmosphere of recession in the world economy which can lead to no good since, whenever world trade slumps, protectionist tendencies increase, as do social conflicts and even international conflicts. There is no more potent cocktail than mixing economic and social conflicts and political conflicts, and we should not forget this in the present situation. These three factors are linked, and Europe has a duty to act on them, and to set an example. We must put a

## Delors

stop to this mad round of oil price rises, the falling dollar and rises in the price of manufactured products. I have just made a simple calculation: since the second oil crisis hit us, the drop in the dollar — approximately 10 % — and the rise in the price of manufactured products — approximately 12 % — has reduced the initial oil price rise of 120 % to 50 %. Now, oil exporting countries are demanding that they should have solid and guaranteed assets in exchange for their trade surpluses. It is up to us to propose a solution. We must put forward suggestions and not try to cheat in the hope that, with the drop in the dollar and inflation at home, we will manage to solve this problem. This is essential not just from the economic but also from the political point of view. In other words, Europe should take steps to create these guaranteed assets which could be in ECUs. Europe should also take steps to refinance some of the petrodollars. You all know how flimsy a house of cards the world money market is; we must do something about this, and the outcome of Venice II, when the International Monetary Fund was invited to make a few symbolic gestures, will not be enough to solve the problem. New international public institutions must be set up to recycle capital, and at the same time we should look into the possibility of declaring a moratorium on the debts of the developing countries. Lastly, the Community must contribute to supporting world economic activity. Believe me, if only the Community could restrict the effects of the recession within its own boundaries, since it is a major exporter and importer, since it is the biggest trade bloc in the world, it would help to boost world trade. And in this way a stop would be put to the inexorable machinery of recessionist policies.

These are the proposals I wanted to make, so that we might at last be able to discuss what definite action can be taken, action which would rule out the possibility of blindly seeking refuge in illusion or in purely institutional approaches to the problem.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Beumer to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

**Mr Beumer.** — (NL) Mr President, following the 1973 oil crisis, the world economy set about the difficult task of adapting to the changed conditions, and by the end of 1978 we thought there were definite signs of at least some degree of recovery. You are all acquainted with the grave repercussions of the crisis — inflation, stagnating production and trade, unemployment and balance of payments problems. It is now obvious — as the Commission says in its report — that the new price shock has interrupted our economic recovery. This fact is brought out most clearly by the 100 000 million surplus run by the OPEC countries in their balance of payments *vis-à-vis* their client coun-

tries. This raises the issue of the limited opportunities for applying these funds and the consequent need for the petrodollars to be recycled.

Can the Commission give us an up-to-date report on the steps that are being taken to recycle the petrodollars to keep damage down to a minimum? Is any coordinated action envisaged? Press reports would seem to indicate that quite a number of individual countries — including Member States of the Community — are conducting negotiations and contracting loans with individual OPEC countries. Does that not mean that weaker countries may be given less of a look-in? This latter question unfortunately affects the developing countries more than any other. Is the Community in a position to offer financial facilities in the form of guarantees to help the poorest countries in particular?

Another question which arises from this is whether the Commission can tell us to what extent the absence of measures to recycle the OPEC surpluses — something to which the report refers — will have a deflationary effect. I should appreciate a little more information on this point.

My Group agrees with the rapporteur that inflation should not only be tackled on its own. Although it is true that inflation is in itself a worrying phenomenon, it can, as a reaction to oil price rises, in turn give rise to further oil price rises. The result will be a vicious circle which it will be very difficult to break out of, and which is one more reason for tackling the problem of inflation with a maximum degree of coordination.

Mr von Bismarck's report refers to the problem of index-linking. The painful fact is that, with a structurally-reduced rate of growth — certainly over the next few years — we cannot retain mechanisms with a more or less built-in inflationary factor. It is also a fact that there must be restrictions on the extent to which the effects of inflation can be allowed to affect profits and government financing. Of course, the lowest paid must be given special protection, which means that we shall have to have recourse to such things as fiscal policy, fiscal harmonization and incomes policy, and which also brings in the problem of convergence between the Member States, where no progress at all is being made as far as I see.

As regards index-linking, the important thing must be to keep down imported price rises as far as possible and not to fan the flames. I mentioned deflation just now. Can the Commission tell us about the likely repercussions of the restoration of balance which is currently taking place in all the Member States, bearing in mind the effects of the moderation in wage demands which is currently under discussion? What would be the effects from the point of view of investment in the Community? However necessary the restoration of balance, the cumulative effect may well be serious.



Beumer

Of course, we must realize that a Keynesian investment policy is impossible in the present situation, given current productive capacity, the lack of jobs in the right places and the tensions on the capital market. We must get back to a situation where financing shortfalls can be met by governments from internal savings, so that monetary financing can be dispensed with as far as possible, thus relieving tension on the capital market without forcing interest rates up.

Of course, this will require greater monetary stability, and experience with the first year of the European Monetary System was not unfavourable.

To what extent would greater harmonization of the instruments available to the central banks in their own countries and credit restrictions be able to guarantee for instance the same or even greater effectiveness in the functioning of the EMS?

The rapporteur rightly points out in paragraph 1 of the motion that we have been living beyond our means rather than cutting our coats according to our cloth. In other words, moderation is what we need, but that implies the need for mutual support, and we should then have to get used to a slower rate of material progress. Society, which was so far characterized more than anything else by a fairly strong emphasis on material consumption and an extensive welfare system, will have to adapt to the changed conditions.

For the time being, we shall have to tell our people that they cannot expect to go on receiving the ever-increasing incomes they have become used to. That is bound to have repercussions on consumption. By stressing the welfare factor, we have at the same time produced a defensive attitude in people. For instance, there is the defensive element in the employment field, directed toward the retention of existing jobs, and this issue has been overstressed to the detriment of the need to create new jobs. In this respect, what we need is a degree of reorientation, accompanied of course by the necessary social measures to cope with the inevitable fall in consumption. Funds will therefore have to be made available for capital investment, bearing in mind the changed situation as regards competition, the energy situation and the need for environmental measures, which will in turn require a high level of effective investment. It therefore follows that the necessary resources will have to be made available. We have spent too long and devoted too much attention to the distribution side and perhaps neglected the production side. What we really need is a more balanced approach.

As the previous speaker said, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs discussed the need for a different and more effective deployment of our labour resources. There must therefore be some prospect of full employment, but in such a way that workers feel involved in what is going on within their company. That will have the effect of improving their

motivation. We must ask the Council and the Commission to draw up draft statements — and Parliament should be given the chance to put forward its own suggestions — in a form suitable for discussion by both sides of industry. If the Council and the Commission have the wherewithal to take the initiative in this matter, Parliament must provide as much material as possible, and we in this House must come up with the necessary consensus to enable the two sides of industry to get into the kind of dialogue which is so sorely needed. Unfortunately, what we have at the moment is not only economic stagnation but also stagnation as regards decision-taking, just at a time when decisive action is more necessary than ever.

**President.** — I call Mr Hopper to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Hopper.** — Mr President, I have been rereading not only Mr von Bismarck's interesting report, but also the underlying documents going back to 1974. It occurs to me that what we need in the European Community is a kind of economic cooperation equivalent to the political cooperation which has been such a success in the past year.

Some may reply that there is already enough discussion within the Community on economic matters. We have the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, which meets from time to time and exchanges information and advice. We have regular meetings of central bankers arising out of the operation of the European Monetary System, and, in addition, outside the scope of the Community, there are meetings of central bankers at Basle and there is of course regular consultation within the OECD.

I would reply that there is, if anything, too much economic discussion. But it is of the wrong sort, and conducted in the wrong way. It tends to be either too general or too technical. When it is conducted on the highest level, as Mr Ruffolo brought out in his report on the EMS, it can be extremely superficial. What is needed is regular informed discussion on the level of the Finance Ministers themselves meeting in economic cooperation. Emphasis should in the first place be upon each explaining his domestic policies and their international implications to his colleagues. Mr President, political cooperation succeeds by the sheer modesty of its pretensions. It is to be hoped that economic cooperation would have the same characteristic. It would seek to promote the concertation of policies as a habit of mind. With the passage of time, mutual understanding would grow. Members will note that the kind of cooperation I am proposing, like political cooperation, would stand in part outside the provisions of the Treaty of Rome. There would be no question of directives imposing policies on Member States.

## Hopper

It is for this reason that the European Democratic Group has moved its amendment to Article 4 seeking to strike out the wish to achieve decisions by majority voting. In the present climate of opinion, it would be wrong to impose a federal-type solution. For those of my friends who are impatient with the slowness of this approach, let me say that in politics timing is all. I am myself fully committed to economic and political union, but I believe that, before we make a quantum leap into a federal or confederal structure such as implied by Mr Bismarck's report, two great tasks have to be accomplished. The first is to complete the common market itself. It is a scandal that, a generation after the signature of the Treaty of Rome, there are still major barriers to the movement of people, goods, services and capital. The second major task is to remove the fundamental imbalances in the financial structure of the EEC itself. Once these great and eminently practical tasks have been completed, we can move forward to a fuller political and economic union. But let us not try to run before we can walk. Mr President, I should like to add how much we agree with paragraph 6 of Mr Bismarck's proposal. It is doubtful whether effective action to save oil will take place unless it is coordinated within the context of a Community energy policy. Such a policy would help all Members of the EEC to invest in substitutes for oil.

Let me end with a very small but I think not unimportant point. I should like to compliment the European Commission on the improvement in its statistical publications. The preparation of these documents is unglamorous but necessary for the making of good economic decisions.

## IN THE CHAIR: MR GONELLA

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Bonaccini to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

**Mr Bonaccini.** — (1) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in the Community as a whole and in the individual Member States the number of unemployed is now reaching record levels. According to OECD estimates, the number of unemployment in the Western economies will rise from 16 750 thousand at the end of 1979 to 24 million by mid-1981.

The day before yesterday, the Belgian Minister of Labour stated that in view of the extent of unemployment in his country he felt that the democratic system itself was threatened. The British Members have drawn attention many times to the extreme seriousness of the conditions in their country. The vital nucleus consisting of the major industrial undertakings in Italy is in the throes of a very serious crisis, and the response of taking minor economic measures is clearly inadequate in the face of the structural decline caused

by the crisis. The sectors which led industrial expansion in the postwar period — steel, the motor industry, consumer durables — seem to be facing serious difficulties in demand, thus joining other more traditional sectors in a state of crisis — shipbuilding and textiles. The forecasts for the French Five-Year Plan give a figure of two and a half million unemployed at the end of the five-year period and call for the creation of new job opportunities.

All this is occurring against a background of international tension and very fierce competition, to which various speakers have already referred, and which enables one to describe the present crisis as the most serious of the last thirty years. The signs are now all too numerous that we are caught in the mechanism of a recession — which is unlikely to be of short duration — accompanied by a high inflation rate. Yet there is no trace of these concerns in the motion for a resolution before us, nor is there so much as a word about restructuring, reduction of working hours, or the need for an adequate policy on employment.

At the end of the year the Western economies will be dominated by stagflation. No one will be surprised if the present situation and the foreseeable future — which have equally serious implications for the cost of living and of essential services — give rise to a very deep anxiety in us, and I think in many other Members of Parliament, and a sense of profound unease among the mass of working people.

In the face of all this, and as a political comment, Mr von Bismarck's motion for a resolution seems to be a very strange parliamentary document, a kind of assortment of imperious demands for the medium and long term — paragraphs 13, 16 and 17, which we would be tempted to support if it were not for the fact that the road to hell is paved with good intentions — and an assortment of calls for considerable and effective decision-making efforts — paragraphs 4 and 7 — precisely at a time when we are all reflecting on the crisis of the Community institutions and bemoaning the lack of any practical short-term policy or decisions. This last fact must obviously seem very strange to us, so much so that one might derive the impression that hard facts are being combated with an insubstantial and diaphanous sword — an impression rapidly dispelled by the first paragraph, which we wish to see removed, and which was inserted by the majority on the Committee on Economic Affairs to make the whole tenor of the motion for a resolution brutally obvious. Quickly conforming to the spirit of the recent Venice Summit, and forgetting that part of the previous opinion which undertook to support economic activity should the cycle decline in the latter part of 1980, the motion for a resolution before you picks on inflation as the main cause for concern.

It is legitimate to complain of the dilatory attitude of the Council, but we should ask ourselves if there are not some signs of resignation even in this Parliament. I

**Bonaccini**

do not think that any of us can doubt the need to fight inflation, but even the most worthy aims cannot be considered in isolation from the time needed to achieve them and from their side-effects, the cost of which, if too drastic a treatment is adopted, could turn out in a very short time to outweigh the benefits obtained.

The motion, in launching a frontal and withering attack on inflation, ignores the social and human costs which would be added to the very heavy burden already weighing upon our peoples and those of the Third World. Macroeconomic aims, even if they are correct in the longer term, end up by having devastating effects if they are pursued in the very short term, given that the general picture is likely to be one of painfully slow growth — if not actual decline, as is already occurring in some Member States.

In essence, the motion for a resolution proposes that we should plump for a hard-line deflationary policy, that we should obtain the consent of the workers to the recession, to the various cuts, and a reduction in the defence of real incomes through changes to the indexing system, and that we should welcome a return to conservative orthodoxy and conventional deflationary measures in the fiscal, monetary and credit fields.

We hope that Parliament will not accept this proposal, which for our part we intend to reject unequivocally, all the more so since the present international monetary system has for some time been playing what amounts to a deflationary role, and the growing inability of the banking system to ensure the recycling of currency surpluses from oil exports aggravates the inadequacies of development policy.

A drastic reorganization of balances of payments carried out without selective criteria would lead to a rapid fall in general economic activity and to the developing countries being presented with another enormous bill.

Why is account not taken of the fact that precisely in the last few weeks the rate of inflation has dropped significantly in the United States, and that it is also tending to fall in the Member States of the Community? More generally, interest rates are falling while the increase in wholesale prices and prices of raw materials is slowing down in various countries. All this indicates that the kind of shock therapy openly advocated in Venice and implicitly taken up here was and is neither essential nor even appropriate. As the Bank for International Settlements points out in its report of 9 June, there are at present two crucial questions for the Western countries — how to find a political answer to high and rising unemployment, and how to finance investment. How can these two problems be tackled, given the present tendency to de-industrialization in our countries, while meeting the Third World's development needs?

We believe that a generalized fight against underdevelopment and to democratize and make international economic life fairer is now the only valid objective for the economic policy of the Community.

This requires that the necessary anti-inflationary measures should involve neither the denial of Europe's economic function nor a severe recessive clampdown.

However, the majority of the Commission obstinately refused to consider even the desirability of a tripartite conference in which these problems could be discussed with the representatives of the workers as a whole. Yet it is possible to follow a road which may take us out of the crisis by creating the conditions for increasing the general productivity and dynamism of our industry without artificially slowing its rhythm. This is what the workers, the peoples of the Third World and the essential interests of Europe demand of you. It is for these reasons that we shall vote against the motion for a resolution.

*(Applause from the Communist and Allies Group)*

**President.** — I call Mr De Clercq to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr De Clercq.** — (NL) Mr President, I should like to begin by thanking Mr von Bismarck and congratulating him on his succinct but none the less sound and full report.

It goes without saying that economic developments in the European Community must be viewed against the background of the situation in the rest of the world, and the Commission's rather sombre conclusions are entirely in line with the present world situation. The not exactly rosy prospects for the rest of this year and 1981 underline this point and should prompt us to increase our efforts to combat the protracted economic crisis. However, our efforts should not be deployed over a wide front; hence the ever-growing need for greater convergence in the policies pursued by the Member States. The whole problem of convergence requires our urgent attention more than ever before, and what it amounts to is the coordination of the Member States' economic policies and the creation of solid foundations for economic growth throughout the Community, a coordinated policy on inflation and employment and the attainment of internal and external economic balance. As Mr von Bismarck rightly said, the problem of economic convergence is closely linked with the question of monetary stability. Economic and Monetary Union is after all a joint process which is developing all the time and which is now one of the European Community's principal aims. Economic convergence therefore implies the desire for European Monetary Union, but it would be wrong to place most of the blame for the embarrassing lack of convergence on the absence of monetary union. After

## De Clercq

all, after one and a half years the European Monetary System is clearly a major success. Despite the economic and monetary instability throughout the world we have succeeded in keeping European currencies within fixed fluctuation margins, and this has resulted in the stabilization of monetary relations and more effective resistance to the oil crisis. In my opinion, the implementation of the second phase of the European Monetary System, planned for 13 March 1981, is absolutely essential. We are astonished that certain Member States like France and Germany — whom we can surely hail as the pioneers of the EMS — are hesitating over the implementation of this second phase. It is also odd that the President-in-Office of the Council — in the otherwise excellent speech he gave yesterday — should have held out little hope of the second phase actually coming into operation on 13 March. This kind of pessimistic outlook seems to me to be wrong if the EMS is ever to achieve what is expected of it. We must do everything in our power to ensure that we stick to the planned dates, so that next year will see the creation of a genuine monetary fund and perhaps even a European central bank. What is the point in delaying this important decision when, bearing everything in mind, the prospects for convergence in 1981 are no worse — or even more favourable — than they are today?

As a result of the budgetary crisis Europe has just emerged from, the Community financing mechanisms were adapted to our requirements and more money was made available for the Regional Fund to improve the short-term structural situation in the European Community. I do not believe therefore that there are now more — or more urgent — reasons for dragging our feet than there were some time ago, when important Member States like France and Germany set themselves up as passionate advocates of European Monetary Union.

What is missing is the political will on the part of the Member States and a belief in the need for monetary integration. A number of positive and concrete steps have been taken towards improving economic relations between the Member States this year, but if we want to increase the momentum, we urgently need a coordinated monetary policy. This can only be achieved by implementing the second phase of the EMS according to plan, and in particular by consolidating credit facilities, the full use of the ECU as a reserve currency and as a unit of account, and by the creation of a genuine monetary fund with its own legal personality, its own powers and clearly formulated duties and resources. With a view to convergence and economic integration within the Community, we must also establish internal and external monetary equilibrium, which can only be achieved given an adequate degree of convergence. This interaction between the two aims seems to us to be a *sine qua non* for economic growth, the creation of more and better jobs

and of new and better future prospects. That is what my Group will be concentrating its efforts on.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Poncelet to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mr Poncelet.** — (F) Ladies and gentlemen, we are here today to discuss the mainlines of our economic policy in the light of this new examination of the economic situation in our Community. I think we should first of all acknowledge and pay tribute to the very sound, very considerable work done by Mr von Bismarck. Nevertheless his report does leave us somewhat sceptical. It does not seem to differ greatly from the report which this House discussed a few months ago when my friend and colleague Mr Deleau spoke of our Group's reaction to the report and put forward several proposals. Even at that time our view was that the first thing that we needed to do was stimulate growth in order to deal with the unemployment which now is universally recognized as stifling our Community, and then to coordinate international action in order to put an end to the staggering rise in interest rates (to which I shall refer again in a moment) in order to allow the investment which is vital to the development of Community exports and to reorganize a number of economic sectors in the light of the need to maintain social balance, to save energy and especially to protect the environment, and what I have in mind here is imports, to which I shall come in a moment. Six months have gone by and we can only note with regret that we are still concerned with the same problems; indeed the economic climate is still characterized by the pessimism on the part of the Member States.

Mr von Bismarck tells us in his report that the economic situation is deteriorating. What is worse is that the number of unemployed in the Community is growing: there are more than six million unemployed men, women and particularly young people about whom we remain quite rightly concerned. It is truly tragic. As for inflation, it is continuing to climb at a rate which I can only describe as staggering. Of course at the first Venice Summit the European leaders talked about an increased rate of growth and said something about the need to support investments — what an agreeable conversation they must have had. But nobody took the decisions which had to be taken. And if one comes down from the European level, with its intentions so agreeably expressed, to the level of national decisions, one can see that there is a gulf. Of course, Europe cannot and does not claim to be able to do everything. Even so, our view is that we must, first of all and urgently, reinforce our common policies, particularly the one genuine integrated common policy we have, which is the common agricultural policy and which I would remind you, has been under attack for some time. And then we must draw up

**Poncelet**

further common policies, draw them up progressively starting with the most urgent need which is for a common energy policy. It is talked about a great deal, it is talked about frequently, not a single decision has yet been taken, despite the fact that this is a very serious problem. This is a subject on which we must not be content with vague objectives. So let us determine the principles on which such a common energy policy should be based. At the second Venice Summit the industrialized countries finally realized the need to 'keep better control of their energy expenditure'. Although this may seem to be a worthwhile step forward, it is far from sufficient. Europe must be able to make proper allowance for both the future price of essential raw materials and the economic strategies of the oil-producing countries. What does this mean? It means that there must be a coherent European policy on energy prices which takes medium-term expectations into account. It means, to give you one factual example, that the Council must adopt regulations immediately to eliminate the anarchical fluctuations in the price of oil on the Rotterdam market, a situation which my colleagues and I have frequently denounced in this very chamber. And once European solidarity is properly understood and accepted by all in practice as well as in the Treaties, it means the pooling of all Community energy resources.

Finally we must complement the policies which are the basis of our national economies with European policies concerned with priority sectors. These complementary policies will of course be the European common policies of the future.

Thus the essential economic coordination of the nine members of the Community must not be taken to mean falling into step with restrictive practices which suit a particular country for a particular reason. The campaign against inflation and unemployment demands different levels of action in different Member States, but that does not mean that action may not be planned jointly. Thus, ladies and gentlemen, with energy costs rising, the way to fight inflation would be for Europe to advise Member States not to take advantage of the anarchical situation on the oil market by imposing prohibitive taxes on consumers. Moreover — and in my own view this is a particularly important point — from the very fact that energy prices have risen, it follows that, as Mr Delors so rightly complained a moment ago, there is a great floating volume of capital on the international market over which Europe has practically no control, or does not wish to acquire the means to exercise control. Governments should agree and agree quickly to control at least part of this capital invested — so far on a short-term basis — in European currencies. If for example only two or three hundred million of the thousand million dollars available were put into productive investments, we would believe me, have taken an important step towards controlling inflation from within.

The specific policy which I have just outlined — and which runs counter to the headlong rush into safe propositions of which we see examples every day in property and gold — should enable the various economic agents to rebuild their confidence. That is why our Group is repeating its demands for jointly fixed European goals to be properly incorporated into a dynamic medium-term economic programme which at the moment our Community seems to be relegating to the background. That is how we will best face the serious difficulties through which many of the basic sectors of our economy are going: steel, construction, chemicals and, still, textiles. I trust you will allow me a moment to consider the textile sector which is particularly at risk. The situation is becoming very worrying indeed in the textile industry and it is a good example of the difficulties which a number of industrial sectors are facing throughout Europe. There are a number of causes. We must act, and act urgently. So what are the facts? Comprehensive European statistics are not yet available but it is clear that the objectives of the Multifibre Arrangement — a European arrangement — have not generally been achieved. The European Economic Community's target was to stabilize the overall level of sensitive textile imports, but the fact is that imports of products covered by the Multifibre Arrangement from countries with low prices have increased in volume from a base 100 in 1976 to 112 in 1979. During the same period the output of the European textile industry fell from 100 to 99. It can also be seen that the deficit on trade with cheap-export countries in this sector increased from 2 805 million EUA in 1977 to 4 500 million in 1979. The 1980 figures show that the situation is worsening and it is time we stepped in. The reasons for the situation are many and widely known. For whilst the European Economic Community remains the only major economic zone in the world to be truly open, an absence of reciprocity can be seen in competitor countries such as Australia and New Zealand, which are closing their markets even more. And then consider what could be said about those countries where workers' conditions are particularly bad. I will not pursue the point.

It is becoming imperative that the Community should take some action to protect its economy, without necessarily going so far as a Malthusian kind of protectionism. That is not what is needed. But we should nevertheless be taking note of the fact that whilst the Americans and the Japanese are taking steps to safeguard their own sensitive sectors which are at risk, we are retaining a totally open economy which is threatening our workers' jobs and incomes. We must act, and act quickly, ladies and gentlemen: if we are not firm enough, we shall be on the losing side in any world-wide economic war.

**President.** — I call Mrs Castellina to speak on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members.

**Mrs Castellina.** — (*I*) Mr President, Mr Delors used the word 'irritation' in connection with this report, and I think he is putting it mildly. I would add the word 'indignation' — indignation over the method followed and the content of this report.

Let me deal first and foremost with the method. On a number of occasions Parliament has touched on — I use that term because it has never really tackled it — the question of the economic situation, and each time it has been said that in-depth analysis and debate would be required. And now we have this report which is not — indeed cannot be — a credible basis for any serious debate, not only because it makes no attempt to analyse economic processes or the way in which the various Community governments have responded to them, but because it avoids the real basic problem of this Community, which has come up so often here — how to initiate a coordinated, convergent and planned policy to reduce the internal imbalances of the Community on the basis of a principle of solidarity leading the richer to help the poorer, i.e. reversing what has so far been the guiding principle of Community policy — given that solidarity is called for in other fields, but in favour of the stronger rather than the weaker. It is sufficient to look at the mechanisms which were put into effect first and foremost in monetary policy and with regard to agricultural policy, as well as the most recent proposal on the iron and steel industry, which will also benefit the stronger regions at the expense of the weaker.

So this report, which ends every sentence with some vague hope that intervention instruments and mechanisms may be improved, is frankly devoid of meaning. It acquires a political meaning in the few clear statements which it makes, which amount to the old reactionary recipes, monetary manipulation, recession, and the abolition of index linking of wages — for that too is to be found in this report. Moreover, recession has already been shown to be an ineffective and inapplicable cure. Whether Mr von Bismarck likes it or not, it is no longer historically possible — and he should realize this — to resort to the traditional ploy of reconstituting a reserve army of labour through unemployment. The working class can no longer be treated as some kind of commodity, and even governments of the Right know this and know that to attempt to do so would be politically too costly in this day and age. Indeed, a true recessive policy is not being implemented anywhere — only futile policies are being pursued. As for index-linking, already openly threatened in Italy, here too we are dealing with the traditional method of making the workers pay without their having any control over the way in which the major resources made available by their sacrifice are used. Experience shows that they are used to support the spontaneous market mechanisms, i.e. the pressures leading to uncontrolled restructuring which in turn causes a further reduction in employment levels and more extensive application of marginal analysis in the name of a productivity criterion based on narrow busi-

ness interests, and which never takes into account the external costs, both human and economic, which such a criterion entails, for unemployment is a cost, indeed a waste — the most conspicuous form of waste in this irrational society which uses a stopwatch to find out whether a worker screws in a bolt in 35 rather than 37 seconds, but never calculates the hours, months and even years wasted by the unemployed.

Mr President, for once the very few minutes available to me are enough, since frankly there would be no point in continuing a debate on the basis of such a report. I think I have made it clear that I shall vote against it.

**President.** — I call Mr De Goede.

**Mr De Goede.** — (*NL*) Mr President, I hope I am not derogating from Mr von Bismarck's merits by calling his report curious. Let me begin, though, by saying what I do wholeheartedly agree with, and that is that the economic policy coordination and consultation procedures set up in the past are inadequate to produce a Community response to the changed economic situation. I agree with Mr von Bismarck that the Community has so far failed to come up with a coordinated energy policy, which is an essential element of economic policy in our situation, and has also failed to come up with appropriate measures as regards energy saving. I agree with him that the political, economic and social imbalances threatening the Community can only be removed by setting up of effective decision-making mechanisms and structures which promote the Community's aims. I also go along with him in calling for more intensive economic consultation between the Council, the Commission and the European Parliament.

What does not meet with my approval is the — if I may say so — over-gloomy introduction to the motion for a resolution. He sets out 13 points, ranging from the accelerating rate of inflation to the slowdown in economic growth and the increase in unemployment. I agree that the picture is not all that rosy, but I should like to remind Mr von Bismarck and all the other Members of this House that exaggerated pessimism can aggravate the situation, which I hope we shall be able to overcome with the help of the measures which he himself advocates. Let me illustrate what I mean. The economic prospects in the Community for 1979 were not viewed with a great deal of optimism either. However, the Commission's report of 5 March this year, reviewing developments in 1979, shows clearly that there was a marked discrepancy between the forecasts and the actual results. In spite of everything, we managed to achieve economic growth of the order of 3.3 %. In particular, there was a sharp rise in private investment — the largest increase since 1973 — the capacity utilization improved employment rate increased sharply by 0.9 % in 1979, there was a

**De Goede**

slower rate of growth of liquid resources, public sector deficits were reduced and exchange rates remained more stable than at any time since 1973.

The point I am trying to make is that our gloomy prognostications may not turn out right after all, not only because of whatever measures we take, but also because of any number of external and unforeseeable factors. I should like to see the Commission, in one of its next reports, compare our forecasts of economic developments with the actual results. I am quite sure that quite large discrepancies would come to light. In my country, the Netherlands, such comparisons are in fact made. The Central Planning Office, a highly capable organization, has often produced accurate forecasts of economic developments, but, over a number of years, they have often been wide of the mark. This comment is intended not as a reproach, but simply as a fact which has some significance as regards future forecasts.

I have no intention of shutting my eyes to the dark clouds gathering on the horizon, but I would warn you against exaggerated pessimism.

One other point I should like to make about the matters raised by the rapporteur in his list of gloom concerns his claim that the low level of investment has not improved for years. I feel that here, Mr von Bismarck has been rather too sweeping in his judgment. What kind of investment does he mean? In my opinion, at least two criteria must apply here. Firstly, we have the kind of investment that creates jobs, and secondly, there is the kind of investment which is an indication of selective growth. Over the last 25 years, we have seen far too often that, in an economic boom, investment can be synonymous with environmental pollution, and can create problems by reducing the number of jobs rather than increasing them. So I should like Mr von Bismarck to tell us just what he means, so that the Commission can also have the benefit of his views.

Finally, I do not agree with the first conclusion drawn by Mr von Bismarck in his motion for a resolution. He is well aware of my objection, which I have stated before. He says that the Member States of the European Community have been and still are living beyond their means, particularly where the economy is concerned. I would not deny that, from time to time in one Member State or another, the economic policy pursued may have aimed higher than economic resources permitted, but I think that this is such a general statement that I shall wholeheartedly support Mr Bonaccini's amendment on this point.

**President.** — I call Mr Rogers.

**Mr Rogers.** — Mr President, I am one of those very simple politicians who believe that society should be

ordered for the common good and for this particular reason I am going to vote against this report because it does nothing, in fact, to help bring about an ordering of society for the common good.

Before I say anything about the report though, I must say that I am absolutely amazed at the attitude of the British Conservatives — they go under another name here — towards this report, particularly paragraph 4 which refers to opportunities for effective measures by majority decision and I was quite appalled in the committee to see that the British Conservatives were supporting majority decisions being taken on vital Community and national issues. I think they have modified their position slightly with the amendment that they have put down and I presume that Mrs Thatcher has told them that they are very naughty boys indeed.

To come to this rather right-wing and amendable report: I will my group vote against the report for many reasons which have been outlined, some of them quite graphically by Mr Delors, but I will be voting against it especially because the report is facile and superficial and adds nothing to the economic debate that is going on at the moment. I do not mean this as a personal reflection upon Mr von Bismarck. He has worked very hard indeed, but his efforts remind me of a man shovelling snow in the Sahara desert: very hard work for no result and, indeed, Mr von Bismarck, your report can be said, perhaps, to evoke the vision of Don Quixote tilting at the windmills of inflation. But where the report is useful is not in what it contains but for two specific reasons outside of what it contains.

First of all, the political ideology behind the report. It is not an economic diagnosis, but simply a rehashing of conventional capitalist responses to the present economic situation, responses that have continually failed, are continually failing and will continually fail, because the system in itself does not exist for the common good. It does not exist for the good of nations. It simply exists for greed and profit and you cannot amend a system that exists for those particular reasons. Indeed the report gives an illustration of this: it complains, for instance, about the lack of investment and I would simply ask Mr von Bismarck, who controls investment? Is it for people's happiness? Is it for jobs for young people? Is it to remove unemployment? No, as you would say yourself, Mr von Bismarck, it exists for maximum profit, profit which is then reinvested for more profit and not for the common good of people.

The second way in which I find this report useful is in what it does not contain. Time does not allow me to proceed on this theme, but my colleague, Mr Delors, has already clearly pointed out the roads that we must follow.

I am sorry, Mr von Bismarck, your vision, your picture of Mother Europe suckling the wayward chil-

Rogers

dren of the Member States, however graphic and romanesque, is only a mirage, and your attack on stubborn nationalism in the introduction to the report this morning means nothing at all, unless you suggest an alternative to the present economic troubles, and your vague definitions do not suggest these alternatives. Your statement that citizens' ignorance creates economic problems is true, but not for the reasons that you state. If citizens were fully aware, and not kept in ignorance, then they would want to destroy your inefficient, corrupt and exploitive system and I include in this system the methods of state capitalism that exist in Eastern Europe as well. Why do you not recognize that capitalism is in crisis; why do you not recognize that capitalism is not a deity that has existed from the birth of this world; why do you not recognize that it is a modern phenomenon; why do you not recognize that it is not working and the only long-term ingredients that are incorporated in it are greed and selfishness while in Europe people are unemployed, factories and capital are under-utilized and yet two-thirds of the world are starving.

**President.** — I call Mr Macario.

**Mr Macario.** — (*I*) Mr President, I would like to give my views on how to get out of the blind alley of living above our means, mentioned by the rapporteur, and on how to achieve a balance between the resources and the aspirations of our peoples.

The world economy is heading for a recession no less serious than that of 1975. In the first half of 1980, the drop in industrial production was especially substantial in the United States — 12 % in the second quarter — and in the United Kingdom, whereas in Germany and Japan production was maintained, but a reduction is forecast for the second half of the year.

In Italy production still appears satisfactory — industrial production increased in April by 3.1 % over the average for the first quarter — but stocks of finished products are piling up and the order books are dwindling. The major industrialized countries have adopted a restrictive economic policy in order to fight inflation and restore equilibrium in their balances of payments, which have been upset by oil price increases. The increase in the price of oil over the last 18 months, and the proposed index-linking of that price to the price of manufactured goods raise two considerable and interconnected problems — the restoration of equilibrium in current balances of payments, and the large-scale transfer of real resources to the oil-producing countries.

The two problems can be solved only by a united European strategy. The basic measures which can be taken are as follows: firstly, a reduction in the rate of growth, accompanied by a drop in the quantity of resources used up internally in consumption or invest-

ment — in other words, a deflationary policy — or, alternatively, maintaining the rate of growth while shifting the internal use of resources towards accumulation of capital, in order to bring about increases in productivity and the restructuring of production, in the energy field as well as in others, so as to permit the transfer of real resources without affecting the internal use of those resources — in other words policies of growth and accumulation which, on an international scale, are compatible with the growth objectives of the oil-producing countries and the insuppressable need for industrialization of the developing countries.

The latter alternative is the only acceptable one in the medium to long term. The trade union movement and the workers must commit themselves, and indeed are already committing themselves fully, to ensuring that this second policy prevails. In this scenario, which obviously implies a slower process of reabsorption of current deficits, and therefore policies of financial recycling at the international level, the trade union movement and the workers must play their part, which certainly cannot consist of waiting passively for others — governments and entrepreneurs — to make proposals and take action.

The problems which have been so much discussed in the last few months — especially a change in the wage-indexation systems and the maintenance of exchange rates — must be seen in the perspective of a choice between the two basic alternatives just mentioned.

Indexation is in fact only one aspect of wages policy. It should be made clear once and for all, that what matters is wage growth as a whole. Control by trade unions of this overall growth is therefore the trump card of the working class for discussing strategies for overcoming the crisis. If the strategy has to be that of not lowering the rate of accumulation and growth, the overall wages policy of the trade unions must be consistent with such a strategy.

Firstly, therefore, it is necessary to encourage investment rather than consumption, and in this connection I would like to mention the recent agreement reached between the Italian Government and the Italian trade unions on the creation of a fund which would take 0.5 % of all salaries in order to provide additional resources for investment in the Italian Mezzogiorno. The first problem, then, is to encourage investment rather than consumption, by proposing — and thereby substituting action for inaction — forms of labour mobility which would permit restructuring in order to strengthen and broaden the productive base.

The maintenance of the exchange rate, apart from being a way of combating inflation, is also part of this strategy for overcoming the crisis, provided that devaluation is correctly regarded as a policy which leads only to the fragmentation of the industrial base and forces it to fall back on products for which the compe-



**Macario**

tition of the developing countries is stronger and still growing.

However, the exchange rate is not an instrument which can be exploited at will. The tensions of the system are reflected in it, and its maintenance is therefore linked to the practical implementation of the policies I mentioned earlier — particularly restriction of consumption and energy saving — and to their success.

Although a wages and employment policy consistent with the development strategy is a necessary condition, it is not enough to ensure the success of the strategy. It must be clear that if one had to rely only on the part which the workers and the trade unions can play in this field, that would mean that in fact one was opting for a strategy of deflation.

The acid test of any plan to cut inflation is in fact to be found in the commitment to growth which it requires of the entrepreneurs and in the policies for reviving investment, housing, alternative sources of energy and strategic sectors of manufacturing industry, especially the automotive and telematics industries, through the mobilization of all sectors, including those under state ownership, led by the large state corporations.

Only if this active policy of accumulation of real wealth is an integral part of a strategy for overcoming the crisis can we hope — in practice and not just in theory — to avoid a classic deflationary policy, since it is unthinkable for a capitalist economy to be capable of spontaneously shifting resources from consumption to investment.

The aim of producing resources in proportion to people's needs is therefore neither an impossible nor a desperate one. It calls for consistent and courageous economic policy decisions, such as those I have suggested. I believe that these represent the true majority desire of the workers and of the European trade union movement for fuller employment with growth.

This is the challenge with which we, Europe, and the joint, converging action of our nine countries are faced. It is a necessary precondition so that Europe may rediscover its role in world affairs, as has been said in the last few days. It will not rediscover that role, and this legitimate and worthy aim could even remain nothing more than a piece of electoral propaganda, if Europe fails to make the courageous decisions which I have suggested.

*(Applause from the centre and the left)*

**President.** — I call Mr Møller.

**Mr Møller.** — (DK) Mr President, this excellent report by Mr von Bismarck provides a basis for a

general economic debate. As we all know, it is not the ripples on the surface of the sea which determine the force or direction of the masses of water, but rather the undercurrent which determines the ripples and hence the movement and force of the water.

When I think of the economic situation over the last few years, it strikes me that one factor has been overlooked, a factor which is not determined by conjunctural policy since, whereas the conjunctural situation can best be compared with ripples on the surface of the water, it is the structure and the structural changes which in fact determine the actual economic situation within the Member States.

We have certainly witnessed structural changes on a world scale since the Second World War. We have witnessed major developments in the history of the world which have been more radical and much more far-reaching than anything before.

From about 1800 until after the Second World War, Europe and the West ruled the rest of the world. They ruled all those countries which we now refer to as the developing countries and used their own transport to bring home the riches of these countries which they enjoyed by virtue of the fact that these countries were either under colonial rule or were nothing but satellites of Western countries.

After the Second World War, there was a major historical movement in the opposite direction. The world was decolonized. However, idealism has its price. One cannot forego one's wealth and at the same time act as if one still has it and continue to live as before. The Western world freed 1 000 million people following the second world war. It gave them political freedom which, in recent years, has been developing into economic freedom. We are now experiencing the consequences of this growing economic freedom, which did not immediately follow the political freedom, as our trade contacts and hegemony in matters of trade were originally maintained. The first example was the oil-producing countries, which realized in 1973 that by sticking together they could establish a sellers' market for themselves rather than being dependent on the wishes of the buyers.

We will see this process repeated with one product after another in the coming years. We can deal with the energy shortage somehow or other, but we cannot do anything about the forces we have set in motion in the free world as a result of decolonization. Idealism has its price, and it is a price which we will now have to pay. This is why, in my view, we must, in our economic thinking, take more account of these basic, fundamental factors than of conjunctural policy. Interest policy and fiscal policy can be used to change a few things here and there. They can be used to make things easier or to make things more difficult, but they cannot change world history. We cannot change world history, but we should be able to use our

**Møller**

Community to devise ways of becoming self-sufficient and guaranteeing independence from the world which has become free and which we will help use its recently acquired freedom to establish prosperity. Mr President, my time is running out. However, I should like to point out one thing, namely that we must pay the price for the major historical developments which took place over the first twenty or thirty years following the second world war, when the colonies were given their freedom and became independent with the result that they have now become economically independent too.

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Pranchère.

**Mr Pranchère.** — (*F*) Mr President, there is nothing at all in this report by Mr von Bismarck. Nothing to help the workers and people understand the basic causes of the crisis which they are going through, and nothing to give them the slightest hope that the tide will turn, since the solutions which are being proposed will only make things worse. All it contains is a cold, detached and laconic list of the symptoms of the crisis.

The weakness of this report on the economic development of the Community during the first half of 1980 illustrates your own inability. Your inability to explain the basic causes of unemployment, inflation and stagnation, because to do so would be to recognize the bankruptcy of your system, of the capitalist system itself with its insurmountable contradictions. It illustrates your political inability, to point a finger at those who are responsible for the present crisis, since it is the policy of the Nine which is responsible and you support it. This report shows up the pointlessness of the whole scheme: hoping to go on in the same way and let workers bear the brunt of the crisis.

But today something new is happening which forces you to realize that you will not always get away with it: the people are beginning to fight back in a more determined way. In France especially, their struggles have frequently caused management and those in authority to think again, to give pay rises, to take people on and to improve working conditions. These struggles are the opposition to the enormous muddle around us today in the cities and the country, in business and in the public services. It is opposition to the restructuring, the dismantling and all the plans for recession and wrecking. This struggle is positive because it is an attempt to maintain our economic potential and our social gains.

None the less there is a sort of logic in the report we have before us today; it is the logic of austerity and

reduced incomes, of worsening unemployment and underemployment. This logic is based on the argument that our countries are living beyond their means. And the consequence of this logic is to tighten the screw of austerity and put even more pressure on workers' incomes.

Such an approach is worse than unacceptable. It is quite disgraceful: French farmers' incomes have already gone down every year for the last six years. Working peoples' purchasing power, indeed all employees' purchasing power in France, has been going down for years, and went down by between 1 and 3 % in 1979.

Where France is living beyond her means is in the profits of multinationals like Rhône-Poulenc, Roussel-Uclaf, Michelin and Peugeot-Citroën. Their profits cannot be doing anything for employment or for workers' incomes since both are declining. When we get down to it, the only solution being put to us is to go on with economic integration and with austerity. On the contrary we must get spending going again by increasing incomes, by supporting investments which create jobs, particularly in the public sector, and we must meet in full the demands of the workers — like the 35 hour week — so that we can create the conditions in which workers can live and work in a different way. The majority in this House is unable to meet those demands, so do not expect us to back such an approach!

**President.** — I call Mr Almirante.

**Mr Almirante.** — (*I*) Mr President, we hope that Mr von Bismarck's report, which has our approval, although some amendments could still be made, will be the beginning of a much wider debate on the lines of the one deriving a few months ago from another report by Mr von Bismarck, dealing with the fight against inflation and unemployment. That report looked at possible solutions, and not only at the causes, and stated that in order to implement a socio-economic programme directed against inflation, recession and unemployment, it was necessary to achieve a so-called 'social contract', i. e. the simultaneous elimination of the class struggle and capitalist privileges to give rise to a European policy of participation.

Despite those suggestions and all the previous and subsequent ones, the situation has worsened instead of improving. Mr von Bismarck's first report has been followed by this second, more pessimistic report which, after identifying the social and economic ills from which the European Community suffers, castigates those responsible. Who is responsible? First and foremost, the various national governments which — as the rapporteur states — have failed to set up the necessary decision-making machinery and have not even used the possibilities envisaged by the Treaty for the implementation of effective measures.

**Almirante**

As a Member of the Italian Parliament I can testify to the unpleasant truth of what the rapporteur says. Italy, which suffers from the highest inflation rate of the whole Community, has in the last few days launched economic measures which take not the slightest account of what should be Community policy, and which threaten to make inflation even worse. And I must add that in Italy the trade unions are as much to blame as the government. But the rapporteur also rightly accuses the Commission, which has not yet completed the task of improving the coordination procedures — a task entrusted to it by a Parliament Resolution of 17 November 1978. The rapporteur also deplores the fact that the Commission has not yet carried out the task entrusted to it by the Resolution published in the Official Journal on 11 December 1978 — that of improving the procedure for consulting the European Parliament — and calls upon — it is significant that the rapporteur uses this term — the Commission to state specifically, in its annual report on the 1980 economic situation and the outlook for 1981, what steps it can take to exert a positive influence on short-term economic developments.

Finally, the rapporteur criticizes the passivity of the Council of Ministers in the face of these tasks which are more urgent than all the others, and warns the Council that it will bear the responsibility for the inevitable future Community crises. I agree, Mr von Bismarck, that at this stage it is necessary also and especially for Parliament to be equal to its responsibilities, to avoid being submerged by a wave of mistrust which could engulf the whole European Community in the minds of the people. This means, for example, that the new comprehensive medium term economic programme taking into account the radically altered situation since 1976, called for in point 16 of Mr von Bismarck's report, must be drawn up by the committees of Parliament, and it means above all that Parliament, under an efficient Presidency, must be able to impose its will and a constructive approach on the other Community Institutions.

*(Applause from the right)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Castle.

**Mrs Castle.** — Mr President, this report is typical of what is wrong with the European Community. It is for ever chasing will-o'-the-wisps about how our economic problems would be solved if only we had more institutions and an ever bigger and bigger bureaucracy. But it is not more decision-making material that Europe needs. It is the political will to change society. The political will to tackle poverty, to set our people to work, to distribute our wealth more evenly. This report contributes nothing whatsoever to that end. Mr von Bismarck said in his remarks that he wished we all had in front of us the Council Directive on stability, growth and employment in the Commu-

nity which it issued in February 1974 so that we could be reminded of it. Well, I happen to have read that directive in preparation for this debate. I must say it contributes absolutely nothing to the solution of the problems we have all been talking about. What in effect it says can be summed up in its own words: 'Member States must possess an adequate set of economic policy instruments'. But all the Member States possess those economic policy instruments. What matters is the use that we make of them. In Britain we have a government which is trying to do exactly what Mr von Bismarck admonished us to do: make the curbing of inflation the first and overriding priority; learn to live within our means. Some honourable Members oppose support that government, but what has been the consequence of that government's policy? The government is using the economic policy instruments to force the economy into a recession of a kind we have not known since the 1930s. Unemployment is due to rise in Britain this year to 2 000 000. Output is flat. Firm after firm is closing down in bankruptcy. The living standards of our people have fallen by 1.5 % in the first quarter of this year. These are the policies by following which, we are told, Europe can save itself.

I say, thank God there is no economic convergence in the European Community. I was in Essen the other week seeing what a Social Democratic government in Germany has been able to do to restructure and revive a once depressed area with contracting industries. I thought of Essen yesterday as I, with other MEPs, received a delegation from the north-west area of Britain, the Industrial Development Association there, who told us of the terrible rise in unemployment it faces, the destruction of the textile industry, pleading for more help. Yet this is an area from which the British Government has withdrawn regional aid and it calls that living within our means. I call it destroying the means by which we live.

What the role of this Parliament ought to be is to mobilize the political will of Europe for fundamental change. The cry should go out from this Parliament that we will not tolerate rising unemployment, depressed areas, the widening gap between rich and poor people and rich and poor areas. We should say we will devote a far greater share of our resources to reviving our industries and stimulating world trade by fighting world poverty.

Last November, Mr President, it looked as though Parliament had made up its mind to be the voice of change. We demanded then a curb on agricultural spending so that we could increase by over 500 million pounds sterling the inadequate money we spend already on regional development, industrial restructuring and social policy. The Socialist Group wanted to go further than that, but at any rate the Parliament voted for that 500 million pounds as an absolute minimum needed to begin implementing the policies we all talk about. But I regret to say, Mr President, this act

### Castle

of defiance has soon petered out. Now the majority of this Parliament say, and they said it this morning, they are ready to settle for an increase in regional and social spending of some 322 millions. Oh, they say, look what we have gained! What they have not reminded us of this morning is that over the same period agricultural spending has increased by over 900 million pounds. This is no formula for fundamental change. We should reject the budget and reject the bankrupt report Mr von Bismarck has put before us today.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Herman.

**Mr Herman.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, Mrs Castle has just given me the opportunity to explain to her that it is both possible and necessary to increase funds for investment in order to give fresh impetus to the economic growth without which we shall not be able to reduce unemployment. Of the revenue we have available at present a considerable part is earmarked for expenditure other than investment, and that is the reason why every country in Europe — and particularly your own, Mrs Castle — is having difficulty returning to a reasonable growth rate: they don't have any funds available for capital investment on worthwhile, viable terms. That is why it is possible to pursue both an anti-inflationary policy and a policy which encourages growth by diverting our resources towards investment and reducing some transfer payments and some consumption expenditure. That condition is fundamental to Europe's return to growth. Once this is done, there are two main policy lines to be followed.

The first is to reduce costs to encourage exports. Europe, in order to regain her place in international trade, must make sure that she remains competitive. And, Mrs Castle, one can be competitive without austerity. One can be competitive by reducing one's finance costs, transport costs and general overheads, and by reducing part of one's public spending (which is not always very effectively allocated), without necessarily reducing capacity and people's standard of living. It seems to me that this is the policy which is at the heart of the Bismarck report, and it is anything but a full-steam-ahead consumer policy whose aim is to rekindle inflation and diminish our competitiveness.

And there is a third point to which I should like to draw your attention, which is that if we wish to get international trade moving again without rekindling inflation we must, at a European level, establish an intelligent policy for the recycling of capital and for aid to the Third World. That is how we will be able to offer the Third World the possibility of buying from us again, of becoming worthwhile economic partners who in turn can find economic stability and growth.

That is something they lack at the moment. So one of the things we must do is to allocate differently, in the light of the oil levy, the funds we have available to carry out this meaningful policy.

That is what the von Bismarck report is about. Perhaps some terms are not made clear enough; perhaps it is too easy to interpret them as a return to the deflationary policies we became familiar with during the great crisis which preceded the Second World War. That is not what is being proposed: we are in favour of growth, of the recycling of capital and of aid to the Third World, which will enable us to re-establish an economic policy without inflationary excesses, a competitive policy which is worthy of our countries and profitable to everyone. And, Mrs Castle, you will not do that by stamping out the first ever real Community policies. One day, when tempers have calmed down and we have done what is necessary to reduce some agricultural surpluses, it will be interesting to look back and see how much the fact that we managed to introduce self-sufficiency in food encouraged long-term growth in Europe, compared with those who only look to the world markets in order to ensure that they have enough to eat. I have made these remarks, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, because it struck me as worthwhile to show you the ways in which a report can be interpreted.

**President.** — I call Sir Brandon Rhys-Williams.

**Sir Brandon Rhys-Williams.** — Mr President, the von Bismarck report makes extremely dismal reading, but unhappily its truth cannot be denied. We want higher investments and not higher interest rates. We want more production, not more unemployment. We want higher exports to developing countries, but we are cutting our aid to them while the energy crisis is driving their people into destitution. We want orderly recycling of capital from the OPEC countries, but we have an increasingly unstable international currency system. Money is flowing into assets like gold, works of art and existing property rather than into new capital projects like the Channel Tunnel — to give an example of a transport improvement which is obviously justified — or the Severn Barrage. The latter is an investment in energy substitution which obviously ought to go ahead and which could well be financed by recycling OPEC funds into this project.

We have to admit, however, that the post-Smithsonian experiment with ethnic paper currencies is proving a failure. We are not getting on top of our economic problems. The situation in which we find ourselves makes one look back to the 1930s. Then we solved our economic problems in effect by rearmament. Nationalist solutions were taken to extremes. Now we must acknowledge the futility of economic nationalism and recognize the truth of the dictum that a nation is the wrong size for economic intervention. It is too big to run an industry and too small to run a currency.

**Rhys-Williams**

The Community has made some progress towards a common currency system by setting up the EMS. In effect, however, the EMS is only a managed float which, as Mr von Bismarck says in paragraph 17 of his report, cannot fulfil its purpose in the long run. He calls for the setting up of a central, largely autonomous authority or monetary fund. I do not entirely disagree with that, but first we have to create the necessary conditions for its success and for its general acceptability.

In the following paragraph, Mr von Bismarck calls on the Commission to realize that its essential task is to put forward proposals for the free movement of capital and equal conditions of competition. This is something on which, I think, we really ought to place more emphasis in this Parliament. Member States will have to abandon their insistence on running their own separate economies with their own fiscal, credit and economic policy objectives.

The position of the United Kingdom in relation to the European Monetary System needs to be clarified. The London market is so large, and so free for movements of hot money from all over the world, that it is not practical for the British authorities to give firm undertakings about rates of exchange in the London market. Sudden capital movements can only be carried on the sterling rate of exchange. No fund would now be large enough to guarantee the cross rates with other Community currencies. As on previous occasions, if the British authorities overreached themselves by giving commitments on convertibility at fixed exchange rates, I believe the experiment would be likely to last for only a few weeks.

We can remedy this situation in two ways. We can either apply in the London market rigid controls over capital movements — but the British authorities are convinced that that would not only be wrong but also futile, and I think we have to accept that in that they are right — or we move towards the creation of a single European market for capital, a united economic community, as envisaged in the Treaty but never yet seriously tried. Then a sudden movement in one financial centre would evoke corresponding movements in all the others, and the effect would be dispersed. In fact, we should all benefit from the stabilizing effect of size in the capital markets. In addition, however, the Community economy would also work more efficiently.

The United Kingdom has made a start by lifting all controls on capital movements in London, but other Member States all maintain controls of greater or less severity. In that, they are defying the Treaty. I propose to table today a motion for a resolution calling on all Member States now to accept their obligations under the Treaty and to relax their controls on movements of capital and restrictions on the developments of the full range of services ancillary to the functioning of an active and free capital market.

Of course, it would not be enough simply to release the flows of funds at institutional level. To create a genuine, free European currency zone it will be necessary to create the conditions in which the whole range of facilities ancillary to a free capital market can also develop and flourish. I am thinking of the commodity markets, the stock exchanges, the private savings institutions, insurance, pension provisions, house purchase finance, and personal and business credit. Parliament should make the creation of a European market for capital a particular target for the 1980s. Of course it will mean a surrender of national sovereignty, of the apparent but actually futile franchise to manage a national paper currency according to the political mood of the moment in each Member State. However, the economic advantages of belonging to a monetary system large enough to cope with dangerous world economic conditions and to re-establish confidence, continuity and stability are obvious and compelling.

The United Kingdom ought now to open negotiations to join the European Monetary System and is entitled in return to call upon the monetary authorities of the other Member States, each as rapidly as it can, to dismantle their controls on currency movements and to end the restrictive practices which are holding back the development of a truly free European market for capital credit and investment.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Petronio.

**Mr Petronio.** — *(I)* Mr President, as Mr Almirante's speech indicated, we shall approve this report by Mr von Bismarck, even though we are convinced of the need for it to be amended in part. We think it presents rather too pessimistic a picture of the present state of Europe. It seems almost that Europe is its own worst enemy. We would like to emphasize that it is beginning to be thought that the fundamental cause of inflation — that scourge from which Europe, and particularly some countries of Europe, have been suffering for so long, and especially now — is not only or even mainly the increase in oil prices. There are other factors which should also be stressed. There have been persistent technical obstacles to the free movement of goods, and there is a money supply and public spending policy pursued by some countries which contributes significantly to inflation, while on the other hand there is low productivity and therefore low competitiveness on the international markets in relation to the dollar and yen areas.

One of the factors which we also think it necessary to stress is what might be called the psycho-political factor. In many countries of the Community there is a lack of confidence which gives rise to a flight of capital and a movement away from savings and investment. As long as this factor is not stressed, people will

**Petronio**

not understand why there is a lack of investment. The fact is that investment is financed from savings and savings must be safeguarded. It is necessary — and unfortunately Mr von Bismarck's report did not do this — to emphasize the role of small and medium sized firms and to ask how fresh money — money from savings — can be directed towards these firms. For this reason we take this opportunity here to repeat an earlier proposal of ours — the proposal to set up a European stock exchange so that savings can circulate freely, as proposed also in point 18 of Mr von Bismarck's report — so that not only persons and goods, but also shares, may have freedom of movement. In this way the risk capital would begin to grow again, and firms could request and obtain investments and savings even from small investors. We should bear in mind not only the large, but also the small investor, who could make use of a suitably controlled stock exchange which was not under the control of a few speculators, and to which the savings of small, medium and large savers could really flow. Only in this way will Europe be able to give free movement within its boundaries to the shares which will bring fresh money to its industries, and hence possibilities of investment, of fighting inflation, and of damping down that expectation of inflation which, by leading to price increases, itself causes further inflation. This expectation of inflation is one of the reasons why the oil-producing countries increase the price of their product in advance.

What Mr Delors was saying is therefore correct — that it is necessary to offer an advantage, or the guarantee of an advantage, to the oil-producing countries, and that the first guarantee which we must offer to them is the stability of our currency, and if possible the stability of a currency such as the ECU which, given the necessary will, could become a reserve currency to match the dollar.

*(Applause from the right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Bonde.

**Mr Bonde.** — (DK) Mr President, the People's Movement intends to vote against Mr von Bismarck's report which advocates even closer coordination of the economies of the nine Member States.

Denmark now has seven years' experience of the Community behind it, and if we look at the main areas of the economy, we must admit that these were seven lean years. At the time of the referendum on Community membership, we were urged to vote in favour of it in order to reduce unemployment. In 1973 there were 21 000 persons unemployed in my country. This year the figure is heading for 200 000. We were also supposed to vote in favour of Community membership in order to bring about a reduction in the interest rate, which has subsequently risen from 12 % to 19 %, one

of the results of which has been that the housing programme in my country has been cut by half. Another reason for joining the Community was supposed to be to bring about a reduction in our foreign debt, which at that time was 17 000 million kroner. This year it is over 100 000 million kroner. I am not one of those who say that Community membership is to blame for all of these things, but I am sure Mr von Bismarck himself realizes that Community directives have at any rate failed to solve any of our economic problems, so what do we want with even stricter directives?

Yesterday we were given a new example of what the Community directives mean in practice. It was the provisions of the Treaty regarding free movement which permitted the sale of B & W (Energy) to the Friedric-Lentjes-Stiftung in Düsseldorf, with which Mr Bismarck is probably more familiar than I am, but this sale followed the same pattern as the sale of the other B & W undertaking to the German MAN, concern of which the chairman of the board of directors, Mr Voissard, is a prominent member of the West German armaments lobby. It is not exports of Danish companies that we need. What we need is to export more Danish products to other countries including Mr von Bismarck's fatherland, which has become expert at profiting from trade with its partners, while at the same time complaining that it is paying too large a contribution to the Community, even though the Community is the very thing which enables it to get away with overrunning the Danish market, to give but one example. In its newspapers, Germany refers to itself as a milk cow, but it would probably be more accurate to call it a milking machine which has suckers fitted to the udders of other cows too.

Mr President, the majority of the people of Denmark are looking forward to the day when we are free of the Community, when, instead of full membership, we will have a general trade agreement like the other Scandinavian countries. We are looking forward to getting out of the 'Common Market in crises', as the main thing we have in common in the Nine is unemployment. It has become quite clear in Europe that those small countries which contented themselves with a general trade agreement, i.e. Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and Austria, have managed to get through the crisis without a marked increase in unemployment. However, those countries which have joined the Community have achieved a European record in the increase in unemployment. This is a pattern we wish to break.

Finally, I must take exception to Mr von Bismarck's attack on index-linking in certain countries, including Denmark, since it is curious reasoning to claim that the amounts paid under this system, which only cover part of the price increases and, furthermore, have been reduced following a request by the Community, and which are paid up to six months after we have paid for the price increases in the shops, are the cause of the

Bonde

price increases. It would be better if Mr von Bismarck did something about putting a stop to increases in the cost of living, since high prices come before payments under an index-linking system, and it is therefore patently obvious that the latter cannot be the cause of the former.

**President.** — I call Mr Ortoli.

**Mr Ortoli, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (F) Mr President, although it is unusual to begin by expressing thanks, I had intended to begin on a note of regret. I will refrain from doing so. My regret was that such an important subject concerning one of the Community's real responsibilities, that is its future, the way in which it is to extricate itself from its pressing difficulties and settle its employment problems, should be discussed in a debate lasting two-and-a-half hours for which none of us feel sufficiently prepared. But I am not going to voice this regret. Indeed, I have the impression that many points have been made which demonstrate that Parliament, while expressing many opposing viewpoints, is very much aware of our common problems and of the need for us to reflect deeply and sincerely on how to deal with them. For my part I regard this debate today as a prelude to the very important debate we are to have in the autumn on the annual report. Then we will have to concentrate, not only in terms of the introduction of practical measures to coordinate policies but also by considering together the issues involved — once again accepting the fact that opposing points of view will be expressed in the course of these discussions — firstly, on how to solve our problems and, secondly, on how the Community can assist in this. I say this because, inevitably, I am obliged — my apologies for this — to speak about the ritual exercise of convergence. This ritual exercise of converging policies also raises the ritual question of the Commission's role. And here the Commission's role, if it is limited to economic management, is not very big. This is because the Treaty itself is a Treaty which, of 248 Articles, devotes just one to short-term economic policy and six to the balance of payments which should allay certain fears regarding excessive supranational powers which we might be tempted to wield. But beyond this, the Commission and the Community have a wider role to play. First of all because our Treaty recognizes certain common objectives. Here our role of examining, prompting, proposing, is very important. Another reason it is important is that we must at all costs progress beyond the type of debate in which we have a tendency to become involved: the debate on the short-term economic situation and on the best way of controlling or not controlling demand. In fact this morning we have not been speaking only about the economic situation. Even if some speeches have dealt first and foremost with broad macro-economic mechanisms, there has also been an awareness of the situation of Europe today, in other words a Commu-

nity beset by common problems. Having problems in common, however, does not necessarily mean that we must act together. It may perhaps oblige us to look at things together, to work together to consider and understand the problems, but this does not of itself entail an obligation to take joint action. Nonetheless there are a number of factors which should lead us to do so. First of all there is the fact that we are a big enough power to be able to make our views heard clearly in the outside world. This is perhaps a role which is not written into the Treaty, but it takes on considerable importance if we realize that we will not solve certain problems unless there is a new world order and unless this new order involves not only dialogue but also the establishment of real co-responsibility so as to settle not only our own problems — problems of employment, of growth and of justice — but also those of all our partners and in particular of the Third World. Secondly, it is incumbent on us, it seems to me, to remember that our principles include solidarity and that, since we form a deeply independent economic entity, the legal fact of market unity necessarily implies a duty of solidarity. I believe that, if one considers certain absolutely basic points, it becomes clear that if we are to profit from this common market, exercise the responsibilities which it involves and also benefit from our standing *vis-à-vis* the outside world, there is a whole sphere of action which goes beyond short-term economic considerations and the recommendations we might make in this field involves an attempt to analyse and implement joint measures to solve the problems. But in that case the Commission's role, or rather the Community's role more than that of the Commission, must be to define the common interest and to determine what we should propose. This does not necessarily mean common policies involving transfers of sovereignty and relying on various instruments in the hands of the Community. It means genuine common strategies which, in certain cases, will form the framework, — in the light of a joint examination of the problems, sometimes leading to harmonized regulations, but in any case with much more attention being given to the external impact — for some joint measures but also for national measures, in other words a series of measures and instruments which remain the responsibility of our Member States. I am convinced, Mr President — and here I support Mr Delors, who said this earlier — I am convinced that we must not disregard fundamental realities. The Community is a reality, with its legal structures, its means for taking action, its rules and its policies. But today we must realize that its responsibilities, even though they are essential, are only partial, complementary, and that the main responsibility continues to lie with the Member States. We must help them to face up to this responsibility, but we cannot, at present, take their place.

This leads me to a second point raised by Mr von Bismarck. In spite of everything, is there not, in the economic and financial sphere, a special place for action by us? I think the answer is yes and I believe

## Ortoli

that the factors I mentioned — the existence of a single market, but also the European monetary system — in fact compel us to try to coordinate our policies more closely. The first step, obviously, is what we call concerted action. This follows from the nature of our market Community, which means that we try to avoid our policies, which operate on the same market, being fundamentally at cross with each other. This is a task which we must pursue, but it will not be easy. We have not got the means to do this directly; we have no central bank, we are not a government, we do not have the same budget as the national governments. Even the present much-discussed Community budget amounts to less than 1 % of Community GNP. However, we must develop coordination of economic and monetary policies and I can assure you that real improvements have been made here in the last few months. I am not saying the situation is entirely satisfactory. First of all, old habits die hard; secondly, let us not forget that the differences between the situations in the various countries of the Community are so great that coordination is difficult, and indeed in some cases increasingly tricky. But it is also true that we have made great strides towards improving our common organizational structure. Today, those bodies which some speakers have been calling for — a more active Council of Ministers and high-level meetings of senior officials — are more and more a reality, mainly in the shape of the Monetary Committee and the Committee of Governors of the central banks.

The third point of Mr von Bismarck's report which I would like to mention is the way we work together and the fact that the Community institutions should try to pool their efforts to tackle and solve the problems. In this context, I personally and the whole Commission are more than willing to work more effectively. You wish to be better informed, as Mr Hooper pointed out. We have tried — and this is a point to which I myself attach particular importance — to improve the flow of information from the Community, if only to lay the foundations for discussion on a broader basis than the national framework. But it is also important to prepare the big debates in depth, in particular within the competent committees. For my part I am ready to do this. We have discussed this with the Commission authorities, but you must remember that we also have our deadlines. This means working on tight schedules, but I am prepared to make the effort. The second aspect of the debate calls for a very long reply, a very long analysis, which I cannot give here. By that I mean that we cannot, today, go into the details of the short-term economic analysis which has gradually developed, in the course of the debate, into a wider analysis of the various problems which face us today or which will arise in the future. This demonstrates the extremely close links we have today between short-term problems on the one hand and medium and long-term problems on the other. It is no longer possible to solve the short-term problems without tackling the medium- and long-term problems. The same is true of the extremely close links

between our internal problems and the external constraints. All our thinking in this sphere must be guided by certain considerations. The first is that we are subject to certain unavoidable constraints. Whether we like it or not they are there. Either we free ourselves from these constraints or they will crush us. Unless we fight to free ourselves, they will wipe us out, whichever way we look at it. The second is that there are also internal constraints resulting from certain trends, both structural and demographic, which we can not escape. The third point is of a different nature. You must excuse me for saying this, perhaps because I am too French, that is too pragmatic, but I do not believe in analyses in which there is only one explanation and one solution. This does not mean that there should not be a policy, that choices should not be made. Choices must be made. But clearly, we must advance on a relatively wide front, applying a complex diagnosis and manifold measures, as in fact the preliminary remarks I have just made show.

In this context, Mr President, I would simply like very briefly to make two or three points which I think it worth stressing.

Firstly, it has been said that inflation should have priority. But there is another priority, that of energy. Here Europe has a role to play, involving what I would call a common strategy, as distinct from common policy in the sense of the transfer of sovereignty. Europe has a role to play and this policy, this joint struggle must find expression in real programmes, demanding programmes, involving joint consideration of the problems, the mobilization — and we have committed ourselves to this — of funds where necessary, in particular loans to assist in implementing programmes, with joint monitoring of progress made and efforts to establish a genuine dialogue on energy questions. And in this dialogue there are not just two parties, the producers and us: we must consider also the energy paupers, those who are poor in two ways, in other words those who have neither energy nor money.

This brings me to my second observation, which concerns the recycling of petro-dollars. In this context I should like to say a word in reply to Mr Delors.

Just now, Mr Delors gave an analysis of inflation which suggested that the causes were more numerous than was generally admitted. However, he should not underestimate another effect of oil price rises apart from the effect on prices; that is quite simply the problem of transfers, in other words the balance-of-payment problem. He did not in fact overlook this, since he called on us to make great efforts to deal with the recycling problem. The transfers imposed on us by rising oil prices, the balance-of-payments problems this creates, the fact that it may force us to introduce even stricter policies and slow down growth, are consequences which are just as important as the direct



## Ortoli

inflationary effect. We must bear this in mind. This observation stresses, moreover, the importance of the financing problem which we must help to resolve.

Let us apply ourselves to this problem with a certain modesty, but also with determination. To explain what I mean by modesty, let me first recall that one of the important points made at the European Council in Venice concerned that fact that, if we are constantly confronted with unforeseen oil price increases which are not justified economically, then the time comes when we can no longer adjust or take responsibility for all the problems of recycling. This is a very important point because it brings our thoughts to bear on other aspects of this policy of dialogue and co-responsibility.

Secondly, I think we have our own recycling problems, which we are in the process of analysing. When the Finance Ministers met informally at Taormina, the problem of the international financing of deficits was the principal subject of discussion for a day and half. I hope, indeed I believe, that it will be possible to draw some conclusions from these discussions and from the ensuing studies, both concerning the manner in which the Community can deal with its own balance-of-payments problems — I am thinking here of Community loans and the various financial mechanisms available to us — and also as regards the contribution which it can make, in conjunction with international organizations or other countries, to the tragic problem of those who have, as I said, neither energy nor money, indeed sometimes not even food, in this terrible world. We shall have to discuss this matter again, and I for my part hope that it will be one of the topics for discussion with the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs in the early autumn.

I now come to the third point, inflation. We are in the process of discussing its causes. But that is not enough; we must think very hard about ways of convincing people that the fight against inflation is not simply a slogan. Remember that it is first of all a requirement of social justice, because we all know who suffers, too often, from inflation. But it is also necessary from the point of view of employment. And this brings me to the basic question towards which all our thinking should be directed: how to achieve a lasting improvement in the employment situation? The fight against inflation is one element here. It is a necessity if we are to improve the employment situation because, with our present raw materials and energy deficit, we will not be able to find a lasting solution to our problems unless we become sufficiently competitive. This is one of the external constraints I mentioned. We must acknowledge it because if we ignore it we will fail in any attempts we make to restore growth by other means.

My fourth remark, Mr President, and this will be the last but one, concerns our joint examination of economic trends in the next annual report. Hitherto,

our proposals have been aimed at a policy for 1980, and there would appear to be no reason to change this policy fundamentally. By that I mean — let us make no mistake about this — that we must pursue our policy of restoring balance. But we have already said — this was pointed out last November and we have made the point again today — that we must be extremely vigilant in assessing the general development of the economy. At our next stocktaking we shall have to see how things stand and consider whether, at least if the recession is deeper than we had forecast, we should not, for example, agree to some compensation for the budgetary gap due to the short-fall in tax receipts. Once again, this is a matter which must be considered again in a few weeks' time.

Mr President, I have not dealt with all the problems but I have presented a mosaic which needs to be fitted together. These are two points in particular which I have not gone into. First of all our structural problems, which we will be dealing with again in the context of the medium-term programme; but I note that the issue has been raised, in particular with regard to the problems of declining industries and of the growth industries of the future. Here I must remind you, coming back to the question of energy, that the struggle facing us is also a struggle for the creation of new industries and new jobs. This is the only sector where we know that if we act forcefully and quickly, we will reap all the benefits at once. That is a great chance in a situation like the present. Easing the grip of the energy crisis, developing new industries, opportunities for creating jobs, stimulating growth: all this should encourage us to supplement the debate on energy independence — and God knows how necessary that is — with a discussion of growth based on this energy struggle I mentioned.

The second point which I have not discussed — though this is not an omission, believe me — is the whole question of policies relating to employment. This is because I gather from what Mr Delors said that a report is being prepared in the Committee on Social Affairs and that the Committee on Economic Affairs also intends to take up the matter. For our part, I hardly need say that we want very much to take part in these discussions. The topic is a complex one, because here again there are no simple answers, no straightforward answers, nor indeed any answers which can apply equally to all our countries. It is true that many of the problems which we have here are common to us all and that we should deal with them together. But it is also true that situations in the various countries are sufficiently different to make it necessary for us to have the sense to recognize not only that core of thought, determination, mutual interests, external action and solidarity which is the foundation of Europe today, but also the existence of different situations requiring different forms of action and intervention in each country.

That, Mr President, was what I wanted to say, as briefly as I could — even if I have exceeded my allot-

## Ortoli

ted time somewhat — to give you a few thoughts on our approach to the problem, and to say how much I hope that this will be only the first of a series of discussions in the great debate we will be having on the economic future of Europe.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr von Bismarck.

**Mr von Bismarck, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies first — Mrs Castle gave me a very bad report, but I should like to retaliate by giving her a very friendly report. Mrs Castle, I admire your spirit and your vitality. One thing we have in common is the fact that we have both probably been in active politics for something like fifty years. I also admire the totally unspoiled and youthfully romantic way in which you judge economic issues without quite grasping them. The classic example of this is your report on Bochum. The German Chancellor you met there has done no more than continue the policy pursued by Ludwig Erhard — albeit in the face of resistance from his left-wingers — and maintained and improved our standard of living and our liberty. That is something you ought to acknowledge, and I think you would be well advised to spread it around other countries as well.

I should like to say to Mr Rogers that liberty has given us the social market economy, a high standard of living and liberty in return, in contrast to this theories. The fact is that, everywhere his theories have been put into practice, they have led only to poverty and dictatorship.

In my opinion, we ought to listen rather more closely to what other people have to say so that we can learn from them. In that spirit, I am very grateful for everything I have heard in the course of this debate. Unfortunately, time does not allow me to thank each of the speakers individually. To my chairman, Mr Delors, I should just like to say that it is not true that the very poor have been forgotten. Mr. Ortoli was right in pointing out that those hit first and hardest by inflation are always the very poor, which is why inflation is so unjust. I could not possibly mention everything in my report; instead, I included those points we made last year, and I should like to stress paragraph 2, which makes this point. That covers the whole spectrum of unemployment, full employment and the need to devote attention to the badly-off. All that is there in black and white. I was not able to repeat it all because the time was simply not available. I would ask you to verify what I say by reading through the report once again. You will find most of the objections that have been raised here already in my report.

Finally, Mr Delors, there is one last thing I should like to say about inflation. Of course, given our four aims, inflation is not everything, but without stability, it will

all come to nought. None of the detailed measures we take to correct short-term economic developments will have any real effect if we fail to keep inflation down to a reasonable level. There is no question of this requiring deflationary policies in the form referred to in the course of the debate. Mr Macario, Mr Herman, Mr Møller and others have already made this point. We must make the shift from consumption to investment very cautiously, taking care not to sacrifice any of the things we have achieved, as Mr Ortoli said — and I thank him for his offer of cooperation. Parliament should accept his offer, make cooperation more effective and be a better listener rather than claiming prematurely that everything the rapporteur said was nonsense.

(Applause)

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

## 8. Urgent procedure

**President.** — I have received two motions for resolutions with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-311/80) by Mr Sarre and others on the future of the car industry;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-312/80) by Mr Rinsche and others on the border incident between Vietnamese troops from Cambodia and Thai troops in Thailand.

The reasons supporting these requests for urgent debate are contained in the documents themselves.

Parliament will be consulted on the urgency of these motions for resolutions at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 1 p.m. and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MRS VEIL

*President*

**President.** — The sitting is resumed.

## 9. Votes

**President.** — The next item is the vote on the motions for resolutions on which the debate has closed.

We shall begin with the two *proposals for the total rejection of the 1980 budget*.

I call Mr Pannella on a point of order.

(Cries)

**Mr Panella.** — (F) Madam President, I am really touched by the enthusiastic acclaim of my colleagues. In order to concentrate their attention and to fuel their enthusiasm just a little bit more, I want to say that before we move on to the vote, Madam President, we ought in my view to have the opinion of the appropriate committee in accordance with Article 6 of the implementing procedures for the budget. I do not think the committee met to discuss the matter.

**President** — Mr Panella, the committee decided not to express an opinion.

**Mr Panella.** — (I) Madam President, there are certain obligations under the Rules which cannot be forgone. It is as though we are refusing to do something which is a legal requirement. I appeal to your legal training. The Rules of Procedure explicitly state:

The committee responsible shall deliver its opinion on such proposal before it is put to the vote in plenary sitting.

The committee cannot get out of this legal requirement, and so we cannot move on to the vote until we have heard its opinion.

**President.** — I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange, chairman of the Committee on Budgets.** — (D) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, we have had the opportunity on earlier occasions to point out in this respect that it is problematical to rely on the Rules of Procedure since they contradict the Treaties in decisive aspects. In view of the fact that Parliament made its position clear with a motion at the last part-session and the committee itself commented on the question of possible rejection of the budget, the requirements of the Treaties have been taken into consideration. The matter was raised and an unfavourable response was given. Mr Pannella's objection should now be irrelevant.

(Applause from certain quarters)

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (F) Madam President, what Mr Lange says is impossible. Neither he nor the committee could have been aware of a proposal for rejection which was not tabled until yesterday.

**President** — In accordance with the decisions taken by Parliament last Monday, the explanations of vote on the total rejection of the budget were given this morning.

I put to the vote the *proposal (Doc. 1-294/80) by Mr Balfe and others: Total rejection of the 1980 budget*.

I have received from Mr Balfe and 16 other signatories a request — seconded by five Members of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members — for a roll-call vote on their proposal for total rejection of the budget. Since I do have here the 21 signatures required by the Rules of Procedure, I ask the Members seeking a roll-call vote to stand.

(More than 21 Members rose)

A roll-call vote will be taken. The electronic voting system will be used for this vote as for all roll-call votes.

I put the proposal to the vote.

The proposal is rejected.\*

I call Mr Lomas on a point of order.

**Mr Lomas.** — My point of order, Madam President, is a question to you regarding explanations of vote. I understand that an explanation of vote can normally be given following a vote on a motion. I should like your ruling on this, because it seems to me that I put down my name to give an explanation of vote but I hear unofficially that this is not be allowed. If this is the case, it seems a curious sort of democratic institution that will forbid Members to express their points of a view on such an important issue as the 1980 budget. Can you give me your ruling, Madam President?

**President.** — Mr Lomas, this matter was discussed on Monday when the agenda was decided. We decided then that explanations of vote would be given by the groups this morning.

(Applause from certain quarters on the right)

\* The detailed result of the vote will be found in the minutes of proceedings.

**President**

I call Mrs Castle.

**Mrs Castle.** — Madam President, could you tell us whether this is the first occasion in the life of this directly elected Parliament that explanations of vote have not been allowed on a major issue?

**President.** — The explanations of vote were given this morning, Mrs Castle. It is customary in this Parliament for voting to take place at a set time, with the explanations of vote beforehand.

*(Applause on the right and centre)*

**Mrs Castle.** — Madam President, I shall therefore amend my question as you have misunderstood it. Is this the first time in the lifetime of this Parliament that individual rights to explanations of vote have been denied?

**President.** — Mrs Castle, in the past there have been several occasions when explanations of vote have been limited to group spokesmen. When I made this proposal on Monday, following the enlarged Bureau's decision in the morning, there were no objections.

I call Mr Seal.

**Mr Seal.** — In that case, Madam President, perhaps you could tell us how it is possible in this democratically elected and democratic House for a minority in any one group to make its explanations known to Parliament.

**President.** — Mr Seal, this matter has to be settled by the groups and not in the plenary sitting.

*(Applause from certain quarters on the right and centre)*

I call Mr Lomas.

**Mr Lomas.** — I understand and accept what you say, Madam President. There was a statement to the effect that a spokesman for each group would give an explanation of vote. That was all agreed, and I do not quarrel with the ruling on that. At the same time we anticipated that under the Rules of Procedure ordinary Members of this Parliament would also be able to give an explanation. Is this Assembly operating on the basis of making up the rules as it goes along? Can people who do not like the sentiments expressed and comments made by others just prevent them from being expressed and jeer and raise all sorts of objections to making a statement on such an important issue as the 1980 budget? There is no democracy in this Parliament.

*(Mixed reactions)*

**President.** — The authors of the proposal are entitled to speak and state the purpose of their proposal.

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(F)* Madam President, I am amazed at the amazement of the Members who have just spoken. I agree with them that there is no democracy in this Parliament and that the Rules of Procedure are being infringed. But, Mrs Castle, it has been going on for eight months now!

**President.** — I call Mr Damseaux.

**Mr Damseaux.** — *(F)* Unlike Mr Pannella, I do not think that there is no democracy in this Parliament. But I refuse to be preached to by Members from a country which denied two million Liberals a right of representation in this Assembly!

**President.** — I put to the vote the *proposal (Doc. 1-300/80) by Mr Pannella and others: Total rejection of the 1980 budget.*

*(Parliament rejected the proposal)*

The proposals for the total rejection of the new draft general budget of the European Communities for 1980 have been rejected by Parliament. On Monday Parliament fixed the deadline for tabling proposals for total rejection at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, 8 July. Since no further proposals for total rejection can be submitted to Parliament, I note that the procedure provided for by Article 203 of the EEC Treaty has been completed and that the general budget of the European Communities for 1980 has been finally adopted.

*(Applause from the centre and right)*

\*  
\*   \*  
\*

**President.** — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the *Luster report (Doc. 1-148/80/rev.)*: *Amendment of Parliament's Rules of Procedure.*

I call Mr Coppieters.

**Mr Coppieters.** — *(NL)* Madam President, on the basis of Rule 32(1)(b) of the Rules of Procedure I propose that this report be referred to the appropriate committee.

## Coppieters

Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, when a parliament decides on its rules and regulations they have to be based on the widest possible consensus. They should not be decided because there happens to be a particular majority present, especially when the rules are being decided one by one.

A careful look at these amendments shows that various sources have tabled similar or even identical amendments. This indicates that the Committee on the Rules of Procedure has been working blindly, for the simple reason that it has been pressured by the Bureau.

When there are so many amendments of a similar nature, I think it is wrong to try to push through this piecemeal alteration of the Rules of Procedure. Pursuant to the Rule I mentioned at the start, I request you to refer this report to the appropriate committee.

**President.** — I call Mr Nyborg.

**Mr Nyborg, Chairman of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.** — (DK) Madam President, I think it emerged quite clearly from what Mr Coppieters said that he would like us to drop the matter completely. It is not merely a question of his wanting to have the matter referred back to committee for further consideration, which is the normal purpose of such a move.

This report was drawn up in response to a request from the enlarged Bureau to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure to look into these matters. In other words, all the political groups represented on the enlarged Bureau asked the Committee on the Rules of Procedure to look into them. We have worked very hard for several months on this, and I therefore think that it would be totally stupid to send it back to the committee. Let us have a decision, and let us have it today.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — I call Mr Rogers to speak against the request.

**Mr Rogers.** — Madam President, I do not think that we should refer this back to committee and I do not think we should accept Mr Coppieters' motion.

At some stage, the House has to agree on a set of rules under which to operate. As Mr Lomas said, Parliament as an institution is being used as a political football by political groups, vested interests and individuals. I certainly have enjoyed the very amusing antics of Mr Pannella, for instance. It is one thing which has kept me sane during the last year. But at some stage we have to go through the trauma of deciding on a set of rules that cannot be altered by the enlarged Bureau

or by Parliament on the basis of political whim, and which will create a proper framework within which the institution can operate and the political groups can exercise their political freedom without interfering with the Parliament as an institution. Therefore even though it means losing Mr Pannella's humour and all the frivolity that he brings to the House, we should persist with this today and finally come to a conclusion.

I accept that some of the rules may be not quite as well drafted as we would like them to be. But, on the other hand, we can make marginal adjustments in the light of experience as we go on. So, for the sake of the Parliament as an institution, I am against reference back to committee, Madam President, even though I greatly regret the loss of Mr Pannella's and other people's antics in the House.

**President.** — I call Mrs Hammerich to speak in favour of the request.

**Mrs Hammerich.** — (DK) Madam President, I will gladly speak in favour of referring Mr Luster's proposal back to committee. Only a few moments ago we had a marvellous example of what things will be like in this Parliament in future. We saw how Members of the British Labour Group were not allowed to give a simple explanation of vote. Up till now, the salvation of the national and political minorities was that we could make our views known in a three-minute explanation of vote. If Mr Luster has his way, this will no longer be the case in future. I recommend that we refer Mr Luster's proposal back to committee — to any old committee, or to any old waste-paper basket.

*(Applause from certain quarters)*

**President.** — I put to the vote Mr Coppieters' request that the report be referred to committee.

The request is rejected.

I have received three amendments, the adoption of which would involve rejection of the alterations proposed in the motion for a resolution and of all the amendments to these texts:

- Amendment No 171 by Mr Bonino seeking to replace the entire motion for a resolution by the following text:

The European Parliament,

— whereas

- the profound political significance of the popular election of the European Parliament implies the need for new Rules of Procedure following a

## President

general and comprehensive re-drafting, to replace the former Rules which are still in force,

- the old Rules were the logical expression of a constitutional arrangement comparable with that existing in the pre-Orleanist French Chambers, in other words Rules embodying exclusively the powers of the ruling authority, and analagous in the Community context to those drawn up by the Council of Ministers and the Commission,
- the direct election of the 'new' Parliament by the people therefore implies the need for 'new' Rules of Procedure rather than an 'episodic' approach amounting to an inconsistent series of partial modifications dictated by the current political situation and the overriding political interest of the existing majority,
- the constitutional history of all countries and at all times has demonstrated that, whenever there are significant changes in the representative nature — not just the representatives — of parliaments, the intrinsic and natural requirements of the institution eventually generate a body of rules reflecting its new representative nature. This occurred in 1958 in the French Assemblies of the Fifth Republic, and in the last century, gradually — as is the British way — but with considerable impact, in the House of Commons, during the transition from 'dualist' parliamentary government to the single authority of 'prime ministerial government'. The same process occurred under the Weimar republic and with the review of the Rules of Procedure in Italy in 1971,
- nothing that
  - whereas all constitutional history shows that parliamentary rules are eventually adapted to the new political situation in parliaments, it appears that the European Parliament is to be unique in that its 'new role', now significantly enhanced in terms of democracy, is to be carried out with a new set of rules which, technically speaking, represent a considerable retrograde step from the existing rules,
  - although the extension of the suffrage and the more democratic and liberal climate which it created led, in France, the United Kingdom, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and Italy, to more liberal and democratic parliamentary procedures, and although the striking 'new factor' of the legitimate authority now invested by the European people in its representatives ought to create a more democratic and liberal climate within the European Parliament and in its institutional relations with the other Community organs, nevertheless certain misleading ambiguities regarding the nature of this progress and this broadening of the base of European Parliamentarianism have provoked dangerous trends,
  - as is well known, many national constitutional orders give pride of place to the pursuit, through institutions and regulations, of workable government rather than to the representation of the people, thus deliberately sacrificing the latter principle,
- the European Parliament is not faced with problems of government, and its role is not to exercise executive power, or support that power, sometimes sacrificing some prerogatives, by providing a solid and effective majority safeguarded by institutional mechanisms,
- the equivalent aim to be pursued by the European Parliament is to be as representative as possible, for it will only be able to fulfil its potential role in history if it embodies, as an institution, the will of the European peoples and truly represents those peoples' political cultures,
- considering that
  - it follows from the above that the political approach and procedures associated with parliaments 'ruled by the majority' are inappropriate to the role of the European Parliament,
  - the only rules of procedure appropriate to the role of the European Parliament are those which ensure maximum representation. This does not mean simply favouring the criterion of 'proportionality' at the expense of minorities, but stressing that 'procedural equality at the outset' is the essential precondition where procedural rules are concerned. Even if proportionality is a relatively acceptable criterion in constitutional systems which have to produce and support a government, procedural equality, without pre-established privileges of a procedural nature for the majority, is the fundamentally correct criterion to ensure maximum representation of European cultures, including the views of minorities, in our Parliament,
  - it should be borne in mind that the majority elected to the European Parliament by popular suffrage consists of the same political and social forces which generally form the governments in the Member States. However, as these governments also appoint the Community executive and form the Council of Ministers, the majority in our Parliament is thus an exact reflection of the 'ruling power', thereby exemplifying an historical and political (and institutional) phenomenon which may justifiably be compared, historically speaking, with the beginnings of parliamentarianism personified (in England as elsewhere) by the 'King's party',
  - it is impossible today for a parliament directly elected by the European peoples with the specific aim of gaining independence from the 'ruling power' spontaneously to endow itself with a body of rules bestowing internal privileges on the 'King's party', just as Léon Gambetta or Clemenceau could not have proposed the Rules of Procedure for the imperial 'Corps Législatif', or Gladstone and Disraeli the Standing Orders introduced in the 17th century, or Rathenau the parliamentary procedure of the Reichstag under Bismarck,
  - effective government in the sense of true representation also implies the attaching of lesser importance to the criterion of the primacy of the group ('groupocracy'),
  - it is inevitable in this day and age that the parliamentary group should take precedence over the

## President

individual Member, in cases where effective government is equated with stable government. It was hardly fortuitous that this trend emerged in the House of Commons at a time when it became necessary to strengthen the cabinet. However, the European Parliament, the function of which is certainly not to support cabinets, has no need for 'groupocracy',

- on the contrary, its intrinsic need to ensure maximum representation means that the elected representatives should be granted increased opportunity to represent the people, and that Parliament should oppose excessive group discipline and, above all, the consolidation in the rules of the power of groups (particularly large groups), at the expense of individual Member's rights,
- there is a dangerous fallacy in the specious argument that, in the event of an assembly of a given numerical size increasing its members, the size of the quorums fixed for the previous assembly should also be increased proportionately,
- that argument would be valid if the practical functions and political role of the Assembly remained the same notwithstanding the increase in the number of its members. However, in the case of the European Parliament, there exists a clear historical and political distinction between the old and the new Assemblies which invalidates the criterion of proportionality;

1. Affirms its endorsement of the criterion of Parliament's 'new role', according to which minorities should not be made impotent but granted an increased opportunity to fulfil their representative function, while emphasizing that many of the national electoral systems used for the election of the European Parliament seriously prejudice the real interests of the people it is supposed to represent;
2. Maintains that if this under-representation due to certain countries' electoral systems was compounded by under-representation in terms of parliamentary procedure, the political and cultural minorities of Europe, which have already been seriously victimized, would have no voice in our Parliament;
3. Affirms its opposition to the reintroduction, in the free European Parliament of the 20th century, of the canon law rejected by the catholic church eight hundred years ago, according to which the majority was and should represent the 'sounder and more valiant part' of an Assembly;
4. Decides to undertake a general review of its Rules of Procedure;
5. Postpones consideration, in the meantime, of any existing amendment to the Rules of Procedure;
6. Instructs the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to commence work on this general review by setting up a working party which will consult competent international experts and take into account the experience of the national parliament.

— Amendment No 53 by Ms Clwyd and others seeking to reword paragraph 1 as follows:

Has decided not to amend its Rules of Procedure until proper consideration has been given to safeguarding and enhancing the democratic rights of all Members of the European Parliament;

— Amendment No 54 by Ms Clwyd and others seeking to reword paragraph 2 as follows:

Therefore instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and to all other committees of the Parliament for their views on these matters by the end of 1980.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Luster, rapporteur.** — (D) Madam President, particularly the first of these three amendments would merit more detailed comment, but I shall refrain and merely say that I am against the adoption of these three amendments.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Madam President, I should like to ask for a separate vote on Amendment No 171, that is, a vote on the indents as a whole and then separate votes on each paragraph.

*(Parliament rejected successively the indents and paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6; it then rejected Amendment No 53, which meant that Amendment No 54 fell)*

**President.** — On Rule 14, I have 11 amendments seeking to reword the text proposed by the rapporteur. They are Amendments Nos 34, 59, 94, 95, 98, 96, 97, 93, 114, 35 and 47.\*

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Luster, rapporteur.** — (D) Madam President, it is the rapporteur's job to play a part in ensuring that as much as possible of the relevant committee's decision gets the support of a majority in the plenary sitting. Voting here is tackled on an *a minori ad majus* rather than on an *a maiori ad minus* basis, working from the smaller to the greater rather than *vice versa*, and this means that it is impossible to get an idea of just where the majority lies. If the rapporteur realizes that this is impossible, he must make a rough assessment. On the basis of such an assessment, which is prompted in the main by the debate which took place here yesterday, I do not feel in my capacity as rapporteur — and I hope this will be properly translated — that I am in a position to recommend rejection of Amendment No 59. Speaking personally, I shall be voting in favour of

\* The full text of the amendments is given in the annex.

**Luster**

Amendment No 59. As for all the other Amendments, I recommend rejection.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 34)*

**President.** — I call Mr D'Angelosante.

**Mr D'Angelosante.** — *(I)* Madam President, we should like a split vote on Amendment No 59 by Mr Galland and Mr Nord. We want a separate vote on paragraph 2 of this amendment because we are against it. We shall be voting in favour of the others.

*(Parliament adopted successively paragraph 1, paragraph 2 and paragraphs 3 to 6 of Amendment No 59, which meant that all the other amendments to Rule 14 fell)*

**President.** — I call the rapporteur.

**Mr Luster, rapporteur.** — *(D)* Madam President, you have just said that all the other amendments fall as a result of the adoption of Amendment No 59. I merely want to point out that this is of course true, to the extent that the text of Amendment No 59 does not deviate from but keeps to the report which we are discussing here. I wonder whether we could, and indeed perhaps we should, vote on Amendment No 56, which underlines the legal basis of our Rules of Procedure. The amendment changes nothing. It merely clarifies the fact that Rules 12(2), 46, 47 and 47(b) remain unchanged in spite of the adoption of Amendment No 59. This would make matters clearer.

**President.** — I cannot give in to your request, Mr Luster. The fact is that Amendment No 59 replaces the old Rule 14 with an entirely new one. This is what the authors wanted.

*(Applause from certain quarters)*

I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — Madam President, as you are probably aware, my group has requested a roll-call vote on a limited number of the very many amendments here. In the particular section with which you are now dealing there was such a request, but it may well be overlooked if we do not have it right now, because the list of amendments that you have read out may be said to have already been dealt with.

On a list which, for your convenience, we submitted before the commencement of business here this evening you will see where we had indicated our intention to call for a roll-call vote on Amendment No 114 and also on Amendment No 35. What I am trying to preserve is the opportunity to have a roll-call vote,

lest the procedure now being followed, which I am not disputing, make it impossible at a later stage to have these particular roll-calls.

**President.** — Mr Blaney, your request for a roll-call vote should also have covered Amendment No 59, which of course had to be put to the vote first.

I call Lord Harmar-Nicholls.

**Lord Harmar-Nicholls.** — Madam President, you have given a ruling. Surely that is that. Any change in your ruling can only bring the Presidency into disrepute.

*(Laughter)*

**President.** — Lord Harmar-Nicholls, there is no argument about the decision. I was merely explaining to Mr Blaney why his request could not be satisfied.

I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — What I would suggest to you, Madam President, is that while you have put the various articles and paragraphs of the new proposed Rule 14 individually to the House and have had them voted on, you have not as yet put the complete text as outlined to the House. Therefore, I feel that the roll-call vote may best be sought at this particular time.

**President.** — Each new rule will be put to the vote at the end of the debate. I shall remember when the time comes that you have asked for a roll-call vote.

On Rule 26(3) I have ten amendments: Nos 64, 86, 140, 36, 139, 33, 38, 19, 55 and 58.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Luster, rapporteur.** — *(D)* Madam President, in line with what I said in connection with Rule 14 and its amendment, let me say that I do not feel I am in a position in my capacity as rapporteur to recommend rejection of Amendment No 19. Personally speaking, I should vote for Amendment No 19. As for all the other amendments you referred to, I recommend rejection.

**President.** — I call Mr D'Angelosante.

**Mr D'Angelosante.** — *(I)* Madam President, can we have a split vote on Amendment No 19 by Mr Patterson, as we intend to vote for subparagraphs (a) to (e) and against (f) to (i)?



*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 64 and then Amendment No 86; by roll-call vote, requested by Mr Blaney on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members, it rejected Amendment No 36; it rejected successively Amendments Nos 139, 33 and 38)*

**President.** — I call Mr Nyborg.

**Mr Nyborg.** — *(DK)* Madam President, on behalf of my Group I should like to request a separate vote on paragraph c), which represents a major departure from the Luster text, since it says that explanations of vote may be given before the vote, and this runs directly contrary to what was approved in committee. I therefore request a separate vote on paragraph c).

**President.** — I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — Madam President, I wish at this stage to indicate my group's desire for a roll-call vote on this particular amendment, all of it.

**President.** — I call Mrs Vayssade.

**Mrs Vayssade.** — *(F)* On behalf of the Socialist Group, Madam President, I should like a separate vote on subparagraphs (e) and (f). A written request to the Chair is a rather cumbersome procedure to our mind, and we are very much against subparagraph (e).

**President.** — I call Mr Chambeiron.

**Mr Chambeiron.** — *(F)* For the sake of a bit of order, Madam President, might I suggest, since there are few paragraphs here and some groups are asking to vote on (a) and (e) while others want to vote on (c) and (d), that we have a vote paragraph by paragraph. This would be the quickest and easiest solution for everyone. It is simply a proposal I wanted to put forward.

**President.** — Since we have been asked to hold a roll-call vote, which unfortunately takes up some time, it is in our own interest to have as few votes as possible.

I call Mr von der Vring.

**Mr von der Vring.** — *(D)* Madam President, there is no point in voting on subparagraphs (e) and (f) together. Can we have a separate vote on (f), since this is really where the problem lies?

*(Parliament adopted by roll-call vote subparagraph (a) and then subparagraph (b) of Amendment No 19)*

**President.** — I call Mr Patterson.

**Mr Patterson.** — Madam President, as the author of this amendment, I think I should point out that if we vote separately on paragraph c) and c) is defeated, the entire remainder of this amendment will lapse because we shall have eliminated from the Rule all explanations of vote by individuals. I think it is necessary to make that clear so that everyone knows what they are doing when voting. A vote against c) now, will mean that all explanations of vote by individuals will be deleted from the Rules.

*(Smiles)*

**President.** — I call Mr Nyborg.

**Mr Nyborg, Chairman of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.** — *(DK)* What Mr Patterson is saying now is more or less 'Take it or leave it'. However, we can always revert to the Luster text.

**President.** — In accordance with standard legislative practice, we decided just now that it was impossible to revert to the old texts. We shall vote on an amendment which contains the whole of Rule 26.

*(Parliament adopted subparagraphs (c), (d) and (e) by successive roll-call votes)*

I call Mr Ferri.

**Mr Ferri, Chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee.** — *(I)* Madam President, I want to quote Rule 54 of the Rules of Procedure, which is in turn derived from Article 142 of the EEC Treaty:

Motions for resolutions amending these Rules . . . shall be adopted only if they secure the votes of a majority of the Members of Parliament.

Article 142 of the EEC Treaty states that the Rules of Procedure are adopted by the Assembly acting by a majority of its Members. It follows that the votes of 206 Members are required for any change. Since this amendment received only 170 votes, it cannot be adopted.

**President.** — Let me put you right on one small point, Mr Ferri. The majority today is 205 and not 206 as one of our colleagues who resigned has not yet been replaced.

As for the comment you have made, we have taken a careful look at the Rules of Procedure and precedent in this matter. It is the motion for a resolution as a whole which needs an absolute majority. If we take a separate vote, rule by rule, a qualified majority is suffi-

**President**

cient. The Rules of Procedure do not indicate that amendments as well have to be adopted by qualified majority. When we adopted amendments to the Rules of Procedure on past occasions, we applied the rule of qualified majority to the motion for a resolution as a whole or to the rules as a whole but not to the amendments affecting a paragraph.

I call Mr Ferri.

**Mr Ferri.** — (I) Madam President, I still harbour reservations about such an interpretation, which I find far too facile. The procedure is explicit and is inclined to respect the minorities in a parliament, because the principle of the majority of the constituents is a guarantee for everyone.

**President.** — The Rule in question makes it quite clear that it is referring to the motion for a resolution and not to the amendments. In any case, we have always been in the habit of applying the rule of simple majority in the case of amendments.

*(Parliament adopted subparagraph (f) by roll-call vote)*

Before we vote on the last three subparagraphs, I shall read out subparagraph (i) which has apparently been omitted from the French version:

When a final vote has been postponed under Rule 33, or for any other reason, and final statements or explanations of vote on the matter have already taken place, no further final statements or explanations of vote shall be admissible before the eventual final vote.

*(Parliament adopted subparagraphs (g), (h) and (i) — which meant that all the other amendments to Rule 26 fell — by roll-call vote)*

I have eight amendments on Rule 31A: Amendments Nos 111, 112, 110, 113, 5, 32, 37 and 50. Among the changes which these amendments seek is to bring the provisions of Rule 31A in line with those adopted in the case of Rule 26(3).

I think that a number of these amendments have already fallen.

I call Mr Luster.

**Mr Luster, rapporteur.** — (D) I entirely agree with you, Madam President, and I hold the same view with regard to Amendments Nos 112, 110, 113, 5, 32 and 37. The only amendment which can be voted on here in my opinion is No 50.

**President.** — I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — Madam President, while bowing to your ruling about what has already fallen, I am afraid

that more has fallen than has been decided or voted upon today, but since there is but one amendment left to put to the House, I would request that we should have a roll-call vote on it. I presume that we shall subsequently hold a vote on the new Article 114 as a whole and that we shall have a roll-call vote on that and on Article 26 as well.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 50 by roll-call vote)*

**President.** — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution proper. After the preamble has been voted on, a separate vote will be taken in turn on Rules 14, 26 and 31A and these votes will be subject to the qualified majority stipulated in Rule 54.

I call Mr Sieglerschmidt.

**Mr Sieglerschmidt.** — (D) Madam President, I just wanted to check when we would get round to the explanations of vote. Is there going to be a final vote, where they are going to be fitted in, or when are we having them? I have asked to give an explanation of vote in fact.

**President.** — Explanations of vote will be given before the motion for a resolution as a whole is put to the vote, Mr Sieglerschmidt.

I have Amendment No 169 before the first indent of the preamble.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Luster, rapporteur.** — (D) It would do no harm to adopt this amendment, Madam President, but it would also be pointless. I must let the Members decide how they are going to vote.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 169 and adopted the first and second indents of the preamble)*

**President.** — I have Amendment No 170 after the second indent of the preamble.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Luster, rapporteur.** — (D) Madam President, I am afraid that the rapporteur fails to comprehend the drift and purpose of this amendment. Since he believes that he has been endowed with average intelligence, he assumes that this lack of comprehension is general and not restricted to his case. Might I plead for rejection?

*(Laughter)*

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 170 and adopted the third indent of the preamble)*

**President.** — We shall now vote on each amended rule as a whole.

I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — Madam President, as you know, my group desires a roll-call vote.

*(A roll-call vote was taken using the electronic voting system; Rule 14 as amended was not adopted as it failed to secure the necessary 205 votes)*

*(Applause from various quarters — Mixed reactions)*

**President.** — The existing text of Rule 14 is therefore retained.

I call Mr Luster.

**Mr Luster, rapporteur.** — *(D)* I have no desire to contradict you, Madam President, especially on an important point. Looking at the Rules of Procedure, however, I find that it says in Rule 54:

Motions for resolutions amending these Rules . . . shall be adopted only if they secure the votes of a majority of the Members of Parliament.

Rule 14 is part of this motion for a resolution just as Rule 14(1), 14(3) or 26(3)(i) is part of the motion.

*(Mixed reactions)*

It is quite possible that parts of the motion do not obtain the qualified majority of 205 votes but that the motion for a resolution as a whole, which you will be putting to the vote at the end, Madam President, does get this qualified majority. I felt it my duty to point this out. That is my view.

*(Applause from certain quarters among the European Democratic Group)*

**President.** — Mr Luster, I explained one or two points earlier, after Mr Ferri had spoken, and I mentioned in particular the texts which serve as our guideline: on the one hand our Rules of Procedure and on the other the fifth part of the Treaty concerning the Community institutions.

On the basis of the regulations which we have always followed, I pointed out that in the case of straightforward amendments to the Rules we have hitherto always considered a simple majority to be adequate. On the other hand, a qualified majority was needed for the Rules as a whole and for the motion for a resolution.

You quoted Rule 54 of our Rules of Procedure but Article 154 of the Treaty states:

The Assembly shall adopt its rules of procedure, acting by a majority of its Members.

Since we are considering here a complete Rule in our Rules of Procedure, we have to assume that it requires the majority of the Members who form this Parliament.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

I call Mr De Goede.

**Mr De Goede.** — *(NL)* Madam President, I entirely agree with you. As rapporteur Mr Luster must of course realize that objections to a specific method of voting must be made before the vote takes place. In view of the fact that the vote has been taken and you have announced the result, the vote is valid.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — I call Mr Galland.

**Mr Galland.** — *(F)* Madam President, this is a particularly disturbing state of affairs, because after three months' work by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions we have reached a point where it is likely that the motion for a resolution is going to be rejected. I fear that some misunderstanding has crept in. I was simply hoping — if there is the slightest chance that we can convince our Socialist colleagues that there was no behind-the-scenes manipulation and that they can accept the spirit in which we worked — that we could give the explanations of vote before putting the Rules to the vote. It is the only way we can hope to settle matters.

**President.** — I am sorry, but since there is no provision in the Rules of Procedure for a second reading, we cannot reconsider the vote on Rule 14.

I call Mr Patterson.

**Mr Patterson.** — Madam President, before we do take a vote on the second part of the Luster report, could I ask you when explanations of vote are going to be taken? If the same thing happens to this as happened to Rule 14, there will be no resolution left and therefore no final vote and therefore no explanations of vote. If they are to be of any use at all, I would ask you to take explanations of vote on Rule 26 now before the final vote. Before we make fools of ourselves we should at least have a chance to explain our position.

*(Loud laughter)*

**President.** — I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — Madam President, I wish to get in my request in time and to ensure that there will be a roll-call vote on Rule 26 as a whole, Rule 31 as a whole and finally, if there is anything left, as somebody has said, on the entire report as a whole.

**President.** — That is what I announced earlier.

In any case, explanations of vote can be given only with regard to the motion for a resolution as a whole, that is, after the vote on the separate Rules. We shall now consider Rule 26 as amended.

*(Rule 26 as amended was not adopted as it failed to secure the necessary 205 votes)*

The existing text of Rule 26 is therefore retained.

There is no reason to vote on Rule 31A as Rule 26 has not been amended. There is also no longer any reason to vote on the motion for a resolution as it no longer contains any proposed amendments.

Explanations of vote may nevertheless be given.

I call Mrs Vayssade.

**Mrs Vayssade.** — (F) Madam President, I wish to explain the reasons for the Socialist Group's negative vote. In spite of what our colleagues opposite might think, we did not feel there was any manipulation. On reading the proposed amendments, we disagreed with the basic content, especially in the case of Rule 14, which increased the number of signatures required to request urgency to a third of the Members of this Parliament, while last November we agreed on a figure of 21. I do not think there is any need to change this requirement. That is why we rejected Rule 14.

As for Rule 26, we do not think it is up to the president alone in a parliament to decide whether explanations of vote have to be presented orally or in writing. The right to stand up and express an opinion is the right of every Member of Parliament. We agreed to a reduction in speaking time but we cannot accept that speaking time be curtailed by the President alone.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) Madam President, speaking on behalf of my group, I must deplore the fact that the amended agenda, which had been so well prepared and which had the support of the entire Bureau, has

suffered this fate. I should like to tell Mrs Vayssade that we held a number of preliminary discussions and repeatedly invited the Socialist Group to help us decide on a joint text. It is really not our fault that — as was evident from this morning's vote on the budget — your group is totally disunited on all important matters. There is nothing we can do about that.

*(Applause from the centre and right)*

Consequently you once again — when it came to the vote on the budget — chose a form of voting which is hardly worthy of a Member of the European Parliament — namely, simply not taking part in the vote.

*(Applause from the centre and right)*

I should also like to tell you that we very much deplore your behaviour. In preliminary discussions with all the political groups represented in this House, we have tried to find a joint basis, which is why my group voted for the amendments tabled by other groups. We now have the task of coming to terms with this situation, but it is about time the Socialist Group gave some thought to the advisability of pursuing a kind of obstructionist policy in this House.

*(Prolonged applause from the centre and right — Cries from the left)*

**President.** — I call Mr Patterson.

**Mr Patterson.** — Madam President, my group voted in favour of these amendments because we believed that the reputation of this Parliament was at stake. We did not get everything we wanted. If we insisted on getting everything we wanted, if everybody insisted on it, nothing would ever be done in this Parliament and certainly not amendments to the Rules of Procedure. Various people did get something of what they wanted. Mr Blaney got his register, Mr Pannella got an absolute right to make personal explanations of vote, the Liberal Group and others have the explanation of vote before the final vote. We did not want many of these things, but we voted for them nonetheless because we believed that the spirit of compromise was necessary for this Parliament to be taken seriously. We must not be under any illusions — and I say this to the Socialists whose conduct is a disgrace — about the fact that if we want this Parliament to be taken seriously by the Commission and the Council, by the national governments and by the people who elected us, if we want any role at all in the efficient running of this Community, we must first be seen to be running our own affairs efficiently.

*(Applause from the centre and from the right)*

That is why my group compromised as far as we did in order to secure some kind of amendment to these

**Patterson**

rules. What the Socialists and others have done by their conduct today is to put back the reputation of this Parliament a very long way indeed. I hope they will go away and think about it seriously, unless, of course, some of them do not wish this Parliament to be run efficiently at all. But we do, and that is why we supported these amendments and that is why we shall go on trying until the Socialists see some sense.

*(Applause from certain quarters in the centre and on the right)*

**President.** — I call Mr D'Angelosante.

**Mr D'Angelosante.** — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I do not know what the Commission and the Council will think of us. I do not know what the governments of the Member States will think of us, nor I do know what the supreme authorities of the Church or any other authorities will think of us.

What I do know, is that our electors — at least the few of them that I know personally, which is far more than Mr Patterson knows — would be deeply outraged if they could only have seen us changed from being parliamentarians, elected members of parliament, into people who are forced to go and write their own proposals on the blackboard and then wait for other people more or less to come along and sign them.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

What would they have said of us — and let me here for once speak about the fishermen in my constituency or the farmers who elected me here — if they had known that we have been reduced to hearing the President saying as if to nursery children, enough of your explanations of vote, from now on I only want your views in writing? They would have considered it a disgraceful performance!

I believe, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, that the vote we have taken this evening in this House, shows how democratically mature this Parliament is and should help to make clear to the VIPs on the Committee on the Rules of Procedure that they are not the masters of our destiny and that they must be more modest when they make proposals aimed at profound changes which most of us find quite unacceptable.

I should also like to say, Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, on the subject of what Mr Klepsch said about a proposal from the enlarged Bureau being rejected by this House, that this proposal was in the first place amended and rejected precisely because of the arrogant attitude of the majority of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure which refused to consider the amendment to Article 12, as was requested by the

Bureau nor did it agree to other proposals by the Bureau.

On this point it only remains for me to sum up, Madam President. In this House we are not divided into 'first eleven' or 'second eleven' Members. There are not large and small groups, poor groups, to whom one does not even so much as give permission to speak. Mr Klepsch said that at the beginning there was an attempt to gain agreement from all groups; this is not true either, since not all the groups were approached. This shows, Madam President, that in this Parliament if we want to work seriously — as we have always tried to do and if we have not succeeded in so doing it is not our fault — we need to respect the views of all, we need to treat all Members as equals and we also need to see a genius on the Rules of Procedure, such as Mr Luster, condescending to discuss matters with people who do not think as he does.

I hope that both this House and the Committee on the Rules of Procedure will learn their lesson and be more modest in the future when dealing with matters concerning the Rules of Procedure.

*(Applause from the extreme left)*

**President.** — I call Mr Galland.

**Mr Galland.** — *(F)* I simply wish to make a few points which should in fact be common knowledge in this House. Mrs Vayssade, at a personal level we are on very good terms; but I am totally shocked and scandalized today at the stand you have taken on behalf of your group. Let me explain. Firstly, Mrs Vayssade, the amendments voted on today were tabled a month ago, and we could have discussed them long before now. You could have expressed your reservations well before now, not today.

Each time we met, even yesterday evening, I tried to find out your group's position and approach. You told me each time that you were unable to state your position since the group had not yet adopted one.

Obviously, with the differences within the Socialist Group and its inability to agree on a position, we, ourselves, find it difficult to work with you.

I would like to point out one thing: you rejected two articles and two amendments. You rejected Article 14 as amended by Mr Nord and myself. Did you realize that this amendment was to the advantage of the major groups and not of the small ones like ours? This amendment actually provides that one third of the members of Parliament are needed, not simply to propose urgent procedure, Mrs Vayssade, but for such a procedure to be automatic. There are 113 in your group, and you only need 135 signatures for the

Galland

urgent procedure to be automatic. Who was being penalized? The Socialist Group or the Liberal and Democratic Group? Let me ask you that.

Secondly, you know very well that we, like yourselves, have tried to defend the right of each Member of Parliament to give an explanation prior to the vote. We fought for this, and that is why Article 26 of the Patterson amendment, provides for personal explanations to be made prior to voting. We too have made some concessions. But you never make any. I call on you to reflect upon what Saint-Exupéry said: 'To unite men, you must teach them to build together.' To build, however, several hands are necessary. Get yourselves organized so we can do it!

*(Applause from the centre and the right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Coppieters.

**Mr Coppieter.** — (NL) Madam President, I should like to give a brief explanation of vote. I hope that my opposition to this report has enabled Members to appreciate my aims, which are to draw attention to the Bureau's abuse of power and its attempts to exert too much pressure on Parliament as a whole, and that it is high time we carried out a wholesale reform of the Rules of Procedure and abandoned the disastrous policy of piecemeal reform.

*(Applause from certain quarters)*

**President.** — I call Mr Sieglerschmidt.

**Mr Sieglerschmidt.** — (D) Madam President, I should like to begin by advising Mr Klepsch not to waste his breath on outbursts of pastoral pathos. The fact is that no serious attempt was made to reach agreement between the various political groups — at least not with my group.

On the other hand, I know for sure that the rapporteur originally described the four amendments I tabled as worth discussing, and then overruled them by his proposed rejection. That is the truth of the matter.

I have nothing more to add to the two substantive points regarding Articles 14 and 26. All I want to say is that, if my highly esteemed colleague rapporteur, Mr Luster from Berlin, had asked my advice in this situation, I should have told him that the convention in the German Bundestag is to amend the rules of procedure only with the House's unanimous approval. I realize of course that that is not possible down to the very last vote in this House, but I would have told Mr Luster that, in view of the flood of amendments from all political groups — and let me stress that they came

from all political groups —, it would be advisable to withdraw the report.

*(Applause from the left)*

**President.** — I call Mr Nyborg.

**Mr Nyborg, Chairman of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions** — (DK) Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, may I try to persuade the House to act a little more sensibly. We will not get anywhere by standing here and calling each other names. Our work must go on, and we can learn from what has happened here today. Obviously, we must accept the outcome of the vote. If one group wants to reject an entire article because of a single point which does not meet with its approval, it is perfectly entitled to do so whether we like it or not. We must realize that, in future, we should not sit here discussing an extensive amendment to an article tabled by an individual member or an individual group. If total amendments of this kind are proposed, they should be rejected. We should only discuss those proposals aimed at amending individual items in the proposal by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure since this is not something that we have arrived at by pure chance. It is the product of three month's work. These are three wasted months, but there is nothing we can do about that. Work must go on. However, it also strikes me as somewhat unrealistic to propose a total revamping of the entire Rules of Procedure. How could any such proposal stand an earthly chance of being adopted here? It would be more sensible to submit changes bit by bit.

Finally, I should like to say that this confirms the point I made at the last part-session, when I said that the root of the trouble was not so much the Rules of Procedure but our unsatisfactory working conditions.

We have insufficient time at our disposal, and it is therefore vital that we should find a single place of work for this Parliament. I should like to urge the Presidency once more to look into this aspect of the matter.

*(Scattered applause from the left)*

**President.** — I call Mr Luster.

**Mr Luster, rapporteur** — (D) Madam President, I believe I am not the only person in this Chamber at the moment who is not exactly in a state of euphoria. I think we all have good cause to feel a little downhearted. My honourable friend from the Socialist Group, Mr Sieglerschmidt, thought it necessary to give me a well-meaning dressing-down. 'If only you had come to me', he said.

**Luster**

I must say — and I think this applies to all of us — that if, after so much work and so much effort, a political group or a group of Members ever again feel obliged to lay down conditions for the acceptance of a piece of legislation as a whole, they should state their intentions in good time before this House. As far as I am concerned, there was no indication whatsoever either in the committee or in the course of yesterday's debate of what was going to happen here today. But despite what has happened, allow me, Madam President, to offer my sincere thanks to all the members of the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions. I hope I am speaking for all of them when I say that we shall not allow this setback to discourage us. We now of course have a situation in which we shall perhaps have to present the House with a general reform involving 20 or 30 articles when we could not even get two accepted. In those circumstances, how can we possibly get 20 or 30 of them through? But perhaps this will have been a lesson to us all, and perhaps we shall be able to make some progress after all. I entirely agree with Mr Patterson that we owe it to this House and to Europe to put our personal feelings last and join forces to tackle the work at hand.

**President.** — I call Lord Harmar Nicholls.

**Lord Harmar-Nicholls.** — Madam President, what has happened, I think, gives some point to the explanation I want to give.

You may have noticed that I abstained through many of the votes that have been taken on the Luster report. I did so because I thought that they were perpetuating a shambles which already exists in our Rules of Procedure. I believe that this Parliament — 410 Members — is trying to take responsibility for too much procedural detail. The result is not democratic majority but a field day for half-baked dialectics. There are dialectics which sometimes are well intentioned but misguided; there are dialectics which are sometimes merely a disruptive ploy or are just blatant publicity stunts. But whichever they are they are wasting the time of a Parliament which was meant to come here and do better things.

If I may just make a personal point. Over the last 43 years I have served in the four levels of government which cover the legislative control of Britain: local government, House of Commons, House of Lords and now the European Parliament. I believe I am the only citizen in the United Kingdom who can claim that. I have to tell my colleagues here, with great sadness, that the procedures of this Parliament are much the worse of the four that I have experienced. And I will say why. It is because the whole of Parliament is assuming tasks which should be left to the President; the form of the agenda, decisions on urgency, the day on which urgent debates shall take place. These things should be decided by the President

on the advice of the Bureau and all the other advisers around her.

We have chosen a President, and we know that when we choose a President to preside over us it should be a person who possesses the objectivity and the impartiality to do these things. Such a person would know that that if our judgement was wrong the Parliament that hired them could fire them. Any deviation from strict impartiality could be dealt with in that way. I believe we have now to establish procedures whereby we hand over the decisions to the President, accept those decisions and work with them. In no other way will we be able to work as a *bona fide* Parliament. I hope that we will soon achieve this. Then I shall in future abstain from abstaining in discussions such as we have had.

(Laughter)

**President.** — I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — Madam President, on behalf of the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members, I would like to express our renewed faith in the possible emergence of democratic practices in this elected Parliament. During the 12 months since the part-session of last July we have had nothing but Luster, Luster and more Luster, all of it designed and engineered to silence the few, the independents, the small groups and the backbenchers of the large groups. We have had another episode of this today. The manner in which it has been dealt with finally is what enables me to believe that all is not yet lost where democratic practices are concerned. Might I, following the example of the last speaker, just draw on some of my experience as well, and say to the House in all sincerity that first of all no one in this group or indeed any part of the backrow of this House, which is often the target of abuse and criticism from those who wish to think that we are lesser mortals, wishes to disrupt the business of the House. We wish to see rules adopted that work, that are seen to work and that are adhered to, Madam President. That is our wish, that is my wish. I have had 31 years in public life. It is not new for me to appear in Parliament and to abide by rules, to be constrained by rules. I wish the rules to be improved. I believe they must be improved. And I would say this from my experience. Call on the expert skill and knowledge that you have in your general secretariat. Draw one representative from each of the nine nationalities, put together with them nine legal experts from the same nine nationalities and ask them to come up with an overall draft of the rules which they believe should be and could be applied. Then let the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and Mr Luster — though I would hope he would be replaced, or that he would now resign since he has been much overworked — look at this draft. I believe this is the only way to do it. It would be an enormous task which would require at

**Blaney**

least six months of the full-time efforts of the best people that you have got, — and you have got some of the best people — with experience of parliaments in all our nine Member States. Bring them together. Let them produce a draft, even if it takes twelve months to do so: better that than what we have gone through today.

But thank you, Madam President, and thank you, the people who by your actions today have seen to it that Mr Luster, despite his hard work, has received confirmation of what he himself said only a fortnight ago, namely that he does not have a great deal of experience of rules of procedure. With that I agree, while at the same time acknowledging the great amount of work that he has put into this. Unfortunately, although he has worked very hard he has not worked very well.

**President.** — I call Mr Ferri.

**Mr Ferri.** — *(I)* Madam President, ladies and gentlemen, I have asked to speak briefly above all because I feel the duty and the need to refute categorically the accusations of obstructionist behaviour which have been levelled at the Socialist Group. The Socialist Group has never behaved in such a manner. If the votes of the Socialist Members were the deciding factor in rejecting an amendment to the Rules of Procedure which would have taken away from each of the elected Members of this House one of his basic and essential rights — that of making an explanation of vote — then we Socialists cannot but feel pride and satisfaction at having acted in a way which was profoundly responsible and democratic.

There is one other point I should like to make, Madam President. A short time ago I drew your attention to the Rules of Procedure and the Treaties and you replied in a manner which I admit was correct. But I should like to point out that with the procedure I suggested, we should not have had the outcome we had today. This is because if we are forced to vote on the whole of an amendment which we have partly accepted and partly rejected, then the only possible result can be what we have seen today; whoever is against so much as one single part of the text will have to vote against the whole text. Those Members who have complained about this ought to have realized what was going to happen when they accepted, probably with great satisfaction, the interpretation — which I repeat is a correct one — as things stand by which an amendment which received only 160 or 170 votes would be considered as approved; they ought to have understood then that, whenever a vote was taken afterwards on the text as a whole, the result could only be what we have seen — the same vote would be repeated for the text as a whole.

Let me suggest to my honourable colleagues on the Committee on the Rules of Procedure that they should

consider two things: first of all, although it is quite right that our Parliament should vote on resolutions when — as is the case for the legislative process — the result of our vote is a document which will be sent on to another institution, I really do not understand why we should have to vote on a resolution when all that is involved is a modification to our Rules of Procedure, i.e. a decision which concerns only us and which takes immediate effect. In my opinion, therefore, the first modification should be to the provisions of Rule 54 (1) of our Rules of Procedure.

Secondly, if it is our main preoccupation — as indeed it should be — to achieve the largest possible consensus here, only such modifications to the Rules of Procedure should be submitted to a vote in this House as are known to have widespread approval, a consensus which must mean more than the majority of the Members of Parliament, otherwise we will always finish up with this situation in which we are quite unable to carry out those modifications on which there might be some sort of general agreement, because when it comes to the vote on the text as a whole, anyone who is not in agreement with an essential part of that text is forced to reject the whole.

**President.** — Mr Ferri, I let you go over your speaking time, because I felt that to some extent at least you were speaking as the chairman of the Legal Affairs Committee. The points which you raised are very important, and I thank you for them. There is no doubt that, when we wish to modify the Rules of Procedure again in the future, we should try to draw up shorter rules and ones which may be more easily agreed upon. In this particular case and as the amendments stood it would have been extremely difficult to divide them up, and if certain paragraphs had been rejected, the text as a whole would no longer have had any meaning.

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — *(I)* Madam President, today we have by this vote really and truly once and for all celebrated our birthday. You did it yesterday with all due ceremony, and we ourselves celebrated it in a slightly different fashion in the House. But the real birthday celebration is the fact that Parliament has confounded the arrogance of the lobbies and their month-long efforts to prevent this major debate on reforming our Rules of Procedure. They tried to prevent it using the Luster method, the Nyborg method, the Klepsch method, the Bangemann method, by submitting a whole series of arbitrary and vague 'fairy-tale' proposals in response to our ten-months old demand to give substance to a wide-varying reform, to which we would have linked all the legal knowledge of Europe, in both constitutional and parliamentary law, at the end of last September, so that our Rules of Procedure should not merely be a document expressed in highly technical



**Pannella**

terms by technicians of ill intent who puff themselves up like bullfrogs — and then promptly burst, as happened only a moment ago — but should express all the legal and democratic culture of Europe. We must do this — this is the path we must follow.

When attempts are made to bring an assembly of this type into step — by counting either on ignorance or misinformation — and not just into step but into 'goose step' — then luckily this House still knows by some miracle how to keep its democratic reflexes.

Madam President, for a long time we have been accused of obstructionism. Today, with its vote, this House has acknowledged that, by our lone stubbornness at various moments during the past year we have, far from being negative, created the necessary conditions for this whole Parliament to take on its clear democratic responsibilities.

I therefore thank my colleagues for this and I hope that, contrary to what I think I understood from what Mr Luster and Mr Nyborg have said umpteen times already, Parliament is changing its tune, because we are fed up with having been called together for the last ten months to discuss nothing at all, to waste time and, Mr Patterson, to make such a poor showing as those who, for the last six months, have forced us to discuss sweet nothings, have made today. I refer of course to Mr Luster's so-called proposals, which are merely codified nothings, and thus since they were null and void they did not survive.

Madam President, I reaffirm our joy at seeing this House today celebrate its birthday in such a fashion. This is a fitting manner in which to celebrate it, and we have pleasure in thanking all those who were instrumental in achieving this result.

**President.** — I call Mr Arndt.

**Mr Arndt.** — *(D)* Madam President, I should like to protest once again against the explanation of vote we heard at the beginning, on the grounds that they have given rise to a misunderstanding here in this House.

The Socialist Group came into this Chamber determined to amend Rules 14 and 26. As you saw clearly enough, the Socialist Group made this point in the first votes. However, it became apparent in the course of voting on the Galland and Patterson amendments that there were still differing views in this House — even with regard to the very purpose of rules of procedure. This point was brought home to me most clearly by Mr Galland's statement to the effect that the Socialist Group should have been able to support the proposal on the grounds that it favoured the strongest group. However, we do not regard the rules of procedure of Parliament as a means of strengthening still further the position of the strongest groups.

*(Applause from certain quarters)*

We regard rules of procedure as a means of pursuing two aims, namely to ensure, firstly that Parliament can conduct its proceedings effectively and, secondly, that particularly the minorities in this House are able to have their say. You must have realized that there were points in both Rule 14 and Rule 26 which the Socialist Group could not possibly support. The fact that our Rules of Procedure require 205 or, normally 206 votes for a majority is a basic principle, and if you fail to get the necessary majority, you cannot go and blame one of the other groups for your failure.

Just to make the point once again that the rapporteur was himself a source of much confusion, Mr Luster first of all opposed the Galland amendment in his capacity as rapporteur, and then said that, speaking personally, he was in favour. What kind of reaction do you expect from an ordinary Member when he hears the rapporteur advising rejection of an amendment on behalf of the committee and then advising acceptance in a personal capacity? In the circumstances, how can you possibly expect to get the necessary 205 or 206 votes?

Let me assure the House that we are still prepared to cooperate in reforming the Rules of Procedure. We have no interest in complying with Mr Pannella's proposal for roll-call votes because we are opposed to the Pannella method of paralyzing broad areas of the work of this House. But perhaps this whole business will at least have served to bring home one point to all the political groups represented in this House, and that is that things cannot be done by way of votes in which those who happen to be in the minority are told they will now have to cooperate, or else . . .

*(Interruption by Mr Klepsch)*

. . . I heard what you said, Mr Klepsch. I warned you before the stable door was left open and the horse bolted that if certain amendments were approved, the Socialist Group would have to vote against the motion as a whole. I would really advise the political groups to try to get together again on this point; after all, one way of ensuring the minimum level of support for an amendment is by way of inter-group requests for urgent procedure agreed on by all parties. If the committee has so far failed to muster sufficient support, another attempt must be made by the political groups.

In conclusion, I must say that, as things looked after the vote here in this House, the great majority of the Socialist Group felt it could no longer vote for the amended Rules 14 and 26. This is something for which you should blame not the Socialist Group, but those who failed to muster the required support for their amendments. I hope this will be a lesson for everyone in this House on how to behave — and how not to behave — in future.

*(Applause from the left)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Dekker.

**Mrs Dekker.** — (NL) Madam President, following the — in many respects — wise words uttered by Mr Arndt, I now have less cause to make various points from our side of the fence on the whole question of this vote. Nevertheless, I feel I must have my say, if only to make a few points more clearly. In the course of yesterday's debate, I stressed the fact that any rules must satisfy the general sense of justice of the people bound by those rules. In other words, if the Rules of Procedure are to be changed, there must be as broad a consensus as possible, embracing all those affected by the change. That was clearly not the case with the proposals we had before us in this debate. This is borne out by the fact that the proposals we eventually voted on said something entirely different from what was contained in the original Luster Report. Previous speakers have already commented sensibly on this point. I hope that the débâcle — which, after all, is what it was — of this attempt to amend the Rules of Procedure will at least teach us that any future attempt to amend them will, I hope, take the form of a well thought-out and properly prepared reform, which will aim for a broad consensus. There should be no attempt whatsoever to place the blame on a minority for the fact that the rules of Procedure have not after all been amended. Clearly, the proposed amendments did not comply with the criterion that they should be more or less acceptable to all those who would eventually be bound by it. After all, any parliament's Rules of Procedure directly affect the way in which the members of that parliament go about their work of representing the people who elect them.

As I said yesterday, we must strike a balance between efficient functioning of Parliament and the Members' responsibility to the people they represent.

I must correct Mr Klepsch on one point he made. If I understood him correctly, he said that the Bureau was unanimous in having some of these proposals placed on the agenda. That is not so since Mr De Goede and — if I remember rightly — the Group for the Technical Coordination and Defence of Independent Groups and Members never agreed to this proposal, because they felt that there was insufficient balance between the efficient functioning of Parliament on the one hand and Members' own responsibility to their voters on the other. They were also against differentiating to such an extent between the political groups and the non-attached members. That is unacceptable to us.

Madam President, I should like to conclude by saying that, as far as I am concerned, the remarks made by Mr Galland and Mr Patterson are contrary to these principles, and that I cannot therefore go along with them. I hope that, when it comes to the next attempt to amend the Rules of Procedure, we shall proceed more sensibly and any such changes will command the support of all of us.

**President.** — I call Mr Møller.

**Mr Møller.** — (DK) Madam President, on this sad occasion all we can do is congratulate Mr Pannella, Mrs Hammerich and their group on the result they have achieved. This is a negative result which means that this Parliament has failed in its attempt to become an effective Parliament. For the rest, there are no winners here today and, probably, no losers either. Apart from the Technical Group, which in this way has continued to undermine the effectiveness of this Parliament, our kind regards and congratulations are also due to those who are not present, as these are the winners today, and if certain people's idea of a major victory is to manage, thanks to the absence of some members, to prevent this Parliament from making decisions, then they are the winners too. However, it seems to me that we have lost this battle, but that there is time to win a future one if only we can get the votes, which, of course, is what we are here for.

I also think that we should now proceed to the next point on the agenda, as we still have a number of important votes to get through before the sitting is closed this evening.

**President.** — I call Mr Capanna.

**Mr Capanna.** — (I) Madam President, yesterday I maintained that the measures put forward by Mr Luster would kill our freedom. Today this whole House has a feeling of greater freedom. Parliament and all its Members are the freer for having avoided the trap laid by the changes proposed by Mr Luster. For this reason, I should like to do something that none of my fellow Members has done, that is to thank Mr Luster.

Madam President, there is no doubt that it is because darkness exists that we appreciate daylight so much. As a result of the efforts made by Mr Luster to restrict the Members' freedom to initiate legislation, they are now more fully aware of and better appreciate the fact of having maintained their rights. Therefore I shall swallow my pride and thank Mr Luster with a smile.

**President.** — I call Mr Bonde.

**Mr Bonde.** — (DK) Madam President, I am pleased to see that Mr Patterson has returned since I should like to take him up on an expression he used. He said that what he had done was to offer a compromise. But what sort of compromise? It was a compromise involving a large number of his own viewpoints — which is rather as if I had plans to knock him down and steal his wallet, and to say by way of a compromise that I only wanted half of what was in it.

**Bonde**

Mr Møller said that it was the Technical Group which had won the day. As I see it, it was not that but Mr Møller himself who won the day, although I realize that he did not actually do very much to win this victory, which was largely a result of the efforts of the Technical Coordination Group. What, after all, have we been fighting for today? We have been fighting for the right of minorities to express their views, their right to comment on questions in this House before the vote is taken. This is Mr Møller's right to disagree with Mr Scott-Hopkins and Mr Tove Nielsens right to disagree with Mr Bangemann, for example. It is the right of the Danish Social Democratic Members to disagree with Mr Glinne. It is the right of the rank and file members to disagree with their party chairmen, so that it is not only the party chairmen who are able to give explanations of vote but the ordinary Members too.

I should therefore like to congratulate Mr Møller on his victory here today and I hope that next time we are faced with an attack of this kind, Mr Møller will again contribute to winning a victory, since it is quite wrong of him to claim that we have been trying to undermine the effectiveness of this Parliament. Contrary to expectations in certain quarters, it is not the members of the People's Movement who have been sabotaging the work in this House. It is not us who table one request for urgent procedure after another. It is not us who give long explanations of vote after every proposal. It is not us who use Parliament's time for pointless debates on the Rules of Procedure. It is Mr Møller's section of the House which excels in using Parliament's time for such matters. I should like to congratulate all the rank and file Members on today's victory.

**President.** — We have thus come to the end of the explanations of vote.

I call Mr Enright on a point of order.

**Mr Enright.** — I should like your ruling, Madam President, under Article 12 of the Rules of Procedure, on a point arising from two voting decisions that we have taken. Last week in Luxembourg, we did in fact vote against the recommendation of the Committee on Development and Cooperation to increase emergency aid and emergency food aid and today we have now accepted that revised budget. This means — and I have checked my facts — that there is no money in the budget which can possibly be used for the measures which are about to be recommended by Mr Marshall on Thursday concerning the dramatic situation of the refugees, especially children, in the Horn of Africa. It does therefore seem to me, Madam President, that it is quite impossible, and would be totally hypocritical, and, as Mr Patterson has said, would be damaging to the reputation of this Parliament, and again, as Lord Harmar-Nicholls said, would be merely indulging in

half-baked dialectic, if we proceeded with that report. I should like you, therefore, Madam President, to rule that as a result of the actions that we have taken as a Parliament we are unable to listen to that report. If that is not the case, then I must say, Madam President, that I cannot associate myself with the hypocrisy of Mr Marshall who voted down the money that could be devoted to that, and for a change I shall absent myself on Thursday and Friday which is something I do not normally do.

**President.** — There is a basic point at issue here, Mr Enright, and the Commission will have to be consulted. We did indeed reject this budgetary item last year and we took a similar line on Cambodia. The Court of Auditors also commented on this matter. Although the Parliament as such has no entry in the budget for this, the Commission has the option of taking over the financial burden. You may either contact the Commission directly or submit your request to the Chair which will forward it to the Commission. The resolution we have adopted can then in fact be implemented.

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the motion for a resolution contained in the *von Bismarck report (Doc. 1-288/80): Economic development of the Community in the first half of 1980.*

*(Parliament adopted the preamble)*

On paragraph 1, Mr Bonaccini has tabled Amendment No 1 seeking to delete the paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr von Bismarck, rapporteur.** — (D) I am against the amendment, Madam President. I request that the text be left in its original form.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted successively paragraph 1 and paragraphs 2 and 3)*

**President.** — On paragraph 4, Mr Scott-Hopkins and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group have tabled Amendment No 2 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Regrets that, despite the Council Decision of 18 February 1974, unfavourable developments within the world economy have not stimulated governments represented in the Council to create the necessary decision-making structures, or to recognize the

**President**

opportunities offered by the Treaty for effective measures by majority decision, except when a vital national interest is involved.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr von Bismarck, rapporteur.** — (D) I do not think this amendment is any improvement, Madam President, I recommend rejection.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 2 and adopted successively paragraph 4 and paragraphs 5 to 10)*

**President.** — On paragraph 11, Mr Scott-Hopkins and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group have tabled Amendment No 3 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Requests that the Commission examine the effect of index-linking on prices in the relevant Member States and submit a report.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr von Bismarck, rapporteur.** — (D) Madam President, I think the wording in the motion is better and the amendment worse. I recommend rejection.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 3 and adopted successively paragraph 11 and paragraphs 12 to 14)*

**President.** — On paragraph 15, Mr Scott-Hopkins and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group have tabled Amendment No 4 seeking to reword the paragraph as follows:

Requests the Commission and Council to seek the views of, and involve more closely, the European Parliament when taking decisions under Article 103 of the EEC Treaty in relation to conjunctural policies.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr von Bismarck, rapporteur.** — (D) The text proposed by the Conservatives is better. I recommend adoption.

*(Parliament adopted successively Amendment No 4, paragraphs 16 and 17 and paragraphs 18 to 20)<sup>1</sup>*

**President.** — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole.

The resolution is adopted.

<sup>1</sup> Amendment No 5 to paragraph 18 by Mr Scott-Hopkins and others was withdrawn.

**10. Urgent procedure**

**President.** — I have received two motions for resolutions with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure:

- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-313/80) by Mr Capanna and others on the Council of Ministers' failure to approve the Seveso directive;
- motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-315/80), tabled by Mrs Clwyd and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, on the dangers of poor hygiene standards in air-conditioning systems.

The reasons supporting these requests for urgent debate are contained in the documents themselves.

Parliament will be consulted on the urgency of these motions for resolutions at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

**11. Agenda for next sitting**

**President.** — The next sitting will take place tomorrow, Thursday, 10 July 1980, at 10 a.m., 3 p.m. and 9 p.m., with the following agenda:

- Decision on urgency
- Janssen van Raay report on the development of an air traffic control system
- Commission statement on the preliminary draft budget of the Communities for 1981
- Prout report on consumer credit
- Joint debate on the Peters report, the Hoff report and an oral question to the Commission on the steel industry
- Joint debate on a von Wogau report on a Community certification procedure for industrial products originating in third countries, a von Wogau report on directives concerning motor vehicles, certain construction plant, textile names, electrical equipment and biodegradability and a de Ferranti report on powered industrial trucks
- Cottrell report on the integration of railway undertakings
- Buttafuoco report on transport infrastructure
- Aigner report on the implementation of the 1979 budget
- Interim report by Mr Kellett-Bowman on the budgetary control of the Data-Processing Centre
- Marshall report on the refugees in the Horn of Africa

3 p.m.: voting time

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 5.50 p.m.)*

## ANNEX

### AMENDMENTS

relating to the motions for a resolution amending  
the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament



# Motion for a resolution amending the Rules of Procedure of the European Parliament

(Doc. 1-148/80)

Amendment No. 1  
tabled by Mr Chambeiron and Mr D'Angelosante

## RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)

Delete the words:

'being not less than one-third of its Members'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 2  
tabled by Mr Chambeiron

## RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)

Delete the words:

'which shall contain the substance of the matter'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 3  
tabled by Mr Chambeiron and Mr D'Angelosante

## RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (3)

Delete the words:

'without debate'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 4  
tabled by Mr Chambeiron

## RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (4)

Replace the words:

'one representative of the persons making the request'

with

'the author or one representative of the authors of the request'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 5  
tabled by Mr Chambeiron

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Article 31A

After the words:

'the minutes of proceedings'

add the words:

'explanations of vote'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 6  
tabled by Mr D'Angelosante

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14

After paragraph 1 add the following paragraph 1a:

'1a. It may be decided to adopt the same procedure for a debate and vote on:

- (a) a motion for a resolution contained in a report already adopted by a committee, but not yet placed on the agenda;
- (b) a resolution submitted for urgent debate by a committee.

An urgent debate may be held without a report or on the basis of an oral report by the appropriate committee.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 7  
tabled by Mr D'Angelosante and Mr Chambeiron

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14

After paragraph 2 add the following paragraph 2a:

'2a. Where a request for urgent debate relates to the placing of a report on the agenda, only the person making the request and the chairman and rapporteur of the committee responsible may be heard, in each case for a maximum of three minutes'.

\* \* \*



Amendment No. 8  
tabled by Mr D'Angelosante and Mr Chambeiron

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (4)

Replace this paragraph by the following:

- '4. If a request for urgent debate is contested, the President shall allow one representative of the persons making the request and one representative of those opposed to it to be heard, in each case for a maximum of three minutes'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 9  
tabled by Mr D'Angelosante

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Second subparagraph of Rule 14 (5)

Delete this subparagraph.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 10  
tabled by Mr D'Angelosante

RULES OF PROCEDURE

First subparagraph of Rule 26 (3)

Delete the word 'oral' in the first line.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 11  
tabled by Mr D'Angelosante

RULES OF PROCEDURE

First subparagraph of Rule 26 (3)

Delete the words:

'on the President's table'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 12  
tabled by Mr D'Angelosante

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Second subparagraph of Rule 26 (3)

Delete the word 'oral' in the first line.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 13  
tabled by Mr D'Angelosante and Mr Chambeiron

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3)

Delete the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth subparagraphs.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 14  
tabled by Mr D'Angelosante

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3)

After the fourth subparagraph add the following:

'Before the final vote individual members may give personal explanations of vote lasting not more than one and a half minutes each'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 15  
tabled by Mr D'Angelosante

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3)

After the fourth subparagraph add the following:

'Before the final vote members who disagree with the voting decision adopted by their group may speak for not more than one and a half minutes to explain why they intend to vote differently.

Non-attached members shall be allowed a total of two explanations of vote, each lasting not more than one and a half minutes.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 16  
tabled by Mr Patterson  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14, paragraph 2

*Delete:* from 'The decision as to whether . . . to . . . to this effect'

*Replace by:* 'A request that a matter is to be treated as urgent'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 17  
 tabled by Mr Patterson  
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14, paragraph 5

*Insert at the beginning:*

'The decision as to whether a matter is to be treated as urgent shall be taken by Parliament. Urgency shall be decided when a majority of those voting, being not less than one-third of Parliament's Members, votes in favour.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 18  
 tabled by Mr Patterson  
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14, paragraph 4, line 7

After 'request'

*Insert:* 'or requests'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 19  
 tabled by Mr Patterson  
 on behalf of the European Democratic Group

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26, paragraph 3

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '3 (a) After the vote on the various provisions or proposals contained in a text submitted to Parliament, but before the final vote, *one spokesman for each political group may make a final statement.*
- (b) A final statement *shall not exceed three minutes.*
- (c) *After any final statements, but before the final vote,* any individual Member may give an explanation of vote.
- (d) An oral explanation of vote by an individual Member shall *not exceed* one and a half minutes.
- (e) *An explanation of vote by an individual Member shall not be admissible unless a written request to give it has been submitted to the President before the start of the first explanation of vote.*
- (f) The President may decide *at any stage that all further* explanations of vote shall be given in writing.
- (g) *A written explanation of vote shall not exceed 150 words, and shall be annexed to the verbatim report of proceedings, provided that the text has been submitted to the President within twenty-four hours of the final vote.*
- (h) *Neither final statements nor* explanations of vote shall be admissible in cases of votes on procedural matters.
- (i) *When a final vote has been postponed under Rule 33, or for any other reason, and final statements or explanations of vote on the matter have already taken place, no*

*further final statements or explanations of vote shall be admissible before the eventual final vote.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 20  
tabled by Mr Patterson  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26, paragraph 3, subparagraphs 1 and 2

Read these subparagraphs as follows:

*'An explanation of vote by an individual Member shall not be admissible unless a written request to give it has been submitted to the President before the start of the first explanation of vote.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 21  
tabled by Mr Patterson  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26, paragraph 3, subparagraph 3

This subparagraph to read as follows:

*'After the vote on the various provisions or proposals contained in a text submitted to Parliament but before the final vote, one spokesman for each political group may make a final statement.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 22  
tabled by Mr Patterson  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26, paragraph 3, subparagraph 4

Replace 'may' by 'shall'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 23  
tabled by Mr Patterson  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26, paragraph 3, subparagraph 5

This subparagraph to read as follows:

*'After any final statements, but before the final vote, any individual Member may given an explanation of vote.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 24  
tabled by Mr Patterson  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26, paragraph 3, subparagraph 6

Read this subparagraph as follows:

*'The President may decide at any stage that all further explanations of vote shall be given in writing.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 25  
tabled by Mr Patterson  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26, paragraph 3, subparagraph 7

Replace 'last for not more than' by '*not exceed*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 26  
tabled by Mr Patterson  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26, paragraph 3, subparagraph 8

Read this subparagraph as follows:

*'A written explanation of vote shall not exceed 150 words, and shall be annexed to the verbatim report of proceedings, provided that the text has been submitted to the President within twenty-four hours of the final vote.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 27  
tabled by Mr Patterson  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26, paragraph 3, subparagraph 9

Delete this subparagraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 28  
tabled by Mr Patterson  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26, paragraph 3, subparagraph 9

This subparagraph to read as follows:

*'The sole purpose of an explanation of vote by an individual Member shall be to clarify his or her final vote on the matter before Parliament.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 29  
tabled by Mr Patterson  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26, paragraph 3, subparagraph 10

Read this subparagraph as follows:

*'Neither final statements nor explanations of vote shall be admissible in the case of votes on procedural motions.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 30  
tabled by Mr Patterson  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26, paragraph 3

Add the following new subparagraph:

*'When a final vote has been postponed under Rule 33, or for any other reason, and final statements or explanations of vote on the matter have already taken place, no further final statements or explanations of vote shall be admissible before the eventual final vote.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 31  
tabled by Mr Patterson  
on behalf of the European Democratic Group

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14, paragraph 5, subparagraph 2

Delete this subparagraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 32  
tabled by Mrs Dekker

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 31A

Reinstate the original text of this Rule.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 33  
tabled by Mrs Dekker

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 26 (3)

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '3. Once the general debate and consideration of the text have been concluded, only explanations of vote shall be permitted before the final vote.

Requests to give oral explanations of vote must be placed on the President's table before the final vote opens.

Members who fail to meet the above time limit may ask for a written explanation of vote not exceeding 150 words to be annexed to the verbatim report of proceedings, provided their text is submitted within twenty-four hours of the final vote on the text.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 34  
tabled by Mr Coppieters

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 14

Delete the proposed new text and replace it with the following:

- '1. A request that a matter be treated as urgent may be made by:

- (a) the President
- (b) the Commission or Council
- (c) a member, a group of members, a political group or committee.

*Where a request for urgent debate is made by the President or by the Commission or Council the President shall notify Parliament of the request during the sitting at which it is received or at the beginning of the next sitting. The request for urgent debate, specifying reasons, shall be distributed in writing and put to the vote at the beginning of the next sitting without debate. Before voting takes place, the President may grant the chairman of the committee concerned leave to speak.*

*Any request by a member, a group of members, a political group or committee shall, if accepted by the President, be displayed in writing, together with the reasons for the request, on a notice board located for that purpose in a permanent and clearly visible place at the entrance to the chamber and members shall be invited to sign it. The President shall automatically accede to a request which is signed by 41 members, by the chairmen of three committees or by the chairmen of three political groups and shall notify Parliament thereof.*

2. *Items for consideration under the procedure for urgent debate shall be placed on the agenda of the sitting of the morning of the last day of the part-session set aside for that purpose. They shall be placed on the agenda in the order in which the requests for urgent debate were accepted.*

*In cases of extreme urgency, the President may, on a request from the author of the request for urgent debate and with the approval of a two-thirds majority of the voters, place the item to which the request relates at the head of the agenda for the following sitting.*

3. *The urgent debate shall be introduced by the author of the request for urgent debate. It shall thereafter be subject to the same rules as other debates. An urgent debate may be held without a report or on the bases of an oral report by the appropriate committee.*
4. *A request for urgent debate may not relate to a matter already placed on the agenda for the part-session or considered by Parliament at one of the two preceding part-sessions. The interpretation of this restriction shall be left to the discretion of the President, having regard to the rapid development of political events. The President shall have the final say on the admissibility of a request for urgent debate.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 35

tabled by Mr Blaney, Group for the Technical Coordination and  
Defence of Independent Groups and Members

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 14

Reinstate the existing text of the Rules of Procedure

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 36

tabled by Mr Blaney, Group for the Technical Coordination and  
Defence of Independent Groups and Members

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 26

Reinstate the existing text of the Rules of Procedure

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 37

tabled by Mr Blaney, Group for the Technical Coordination and  
Defence of Independent Groups and Members

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 31A

Reinstate the existing text of the Rules of Procedure

\* \* \*



Amendment No. 38  
tabled by Mr Blaney

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3)

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '3 In debates which have been conducted subject to a time limit and under the terms of Rule 28 and 36 a), once the general debate and consideration of the texts have been concluded, explanations of vote shall be permitted before the matter as a whole is put to the vote.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 39  
tabled by Mr Blaney

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (1)

Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 40  
tabled by Mr Blaney

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '2 A request that a debate be treated as urgent may be made to the President by at least twenty-one Members, or by the Commission or the Council. As soon as the President receives a request for urgent debate, he shall inform Parliament.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 41  
tabled by Mr Blaney

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (3), (4), (5) and (6)

Replace these paragraphs with the following single paragraph:

- '3. The President shall decide whether to grant the request for a debate to be treated as urgent and shall announce his decision to Parliament. The President shall decide when the point will be included in the agenda. This shall not be later than the end of the part-session.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 42  
tabled by Mr Sieglerschmidt

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (5)  
Delete the second sentence of this paragraph.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 43  
tabled by Mr Sieglerschmidt

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (4)  
Delete this paragraph.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 44  
tabled by Mr Sieglerschmidt

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)  
Delete the words:  
'being not less than one third of its Members'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 45  
tabled by Mr Sieglerschmidt

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (1)  
Add the following to this paragraph:  
'but without prejudice to the provisions of Rules 12 (2), 47 (5) and 47 B.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 46  
tabled by Mr Sieglerschmidt

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), sixth subparagraph  
Delete this subparagraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 47  
tabled by Mrs Krouwel-Vlam and Mr van Minnen

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14  
Reinstate original text of this Rule.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 48  
tabled by Mrs Krouwel-Vlam and Mr van Minnen

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), first subparagraph  
Replace the words 'final vote'  
with:  
'vote on the motion for a resolution as a whole'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 49  
tabled by Mrs Krouwel-Vlam and Mr van Minnen

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), fifth, sixth and seventh subparagraphs  
These three subparagraphs to be replaced by the following text:  
'Oral explanations of vote by individual Members may not last more than one and a half minutes.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 50  
tabled by Mrs Krouwel-Vlam and Mr van Minnen

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 31A  
Add the following after the words 'personal statements':  
'other than those mentioned in Rule 26 (3)'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 51  
tabled by Mrs Krouwel-Vlam and Mr Van Minnen

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3) 9th subparagraph  
Delete this subparagraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 52  
tabled by Mrs Krouwel-Vlam and Mr van Minnen

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), eighth subparagraph

This subparagraph to read as follows:

'Members who fail to meet the time limit stipulated in the first subparagraph of *this paragraph* may ask for a written explanation of vote not exceeding 150 words to be annexed to the verbatim report of proceedings provided that their text is submitted within twenty-four hours of the final vote on the text'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 53  
tabled by Mrs Clwyd, Mr Boyes and Mr Seal

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 1

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '1. Has decided not to amend its Rules of Procedure until proper consideration has been given to safeguarding and enhancing the democratic rights of all Members of the European Parliament;'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 54  
tabled by Mrs Clwyd, Mr Boyes and Mr Seal

Motion for a resolution

Paragraph 2

This paragraph to read as follows:

- '2. Therefore instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and to all other committees of the Parliament for their views on these matters by the end of 1980.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 55  
tabled by Mr Adonnino

Rules

Rule 26 (3)

Amend this paragraph to read as follows:

3. (a) *After the vote on the various provisions or proposals contained in a text submitted to Parliament but before the final vote, each political group may make a statement (final statement).*
- (b) *Such a statement may not exceed three minutes.*

- (c) *After the result of the final vote has been announced, individual Members may give oral or written explanations (explanations of vote).*
- (d) *Oral explanations of vote shall last for not more than one and a half minutes.*
- (e) *Requests to make oral explanations of vote must be placed on the President's table before the final vote opens.*
- (f) *Taking account of the situation, the President may decide that the explanations of vote shall be given in writing.*
- (g) *Members who fail to meet the time limit stipulated above may ask for a written explanation of vote not exceeding 150 words to be annexed to the verbatim report of proceedings provided that their text is submitted within 24 hours of the final vote on the text.*
- (h) *The President may only admit explanations of vote intended to prevent any misunderstanding of the voting behaviour of a Member.*
- (i) *Explanations of vote shall not be admissible in the case of votes on procedural motions.*
- (j) *Where a final vote is adjourned pursuant to Rule 33 or for any other reason and where final statements or explanations of vote have already been made on the matter concerned, no further final statements or declarations of vote may be made before the actual final vote.*

Rules 27 to 31 unchanged

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 56  
tabled by Mr Adonnino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 14 (1)

Add the following to this paragraph:

'without prejudice to the provisions of Rule 12 (2), Rule 46 and Rules 47 and 47 B'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 57  
tabled by Mr Adonnino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 14 (2)

Replace the last sentence by the following:

'A request that a debate be treated as urgent shall be submitted in writing and supported by reasons. Requests from Members shall be accompanied by a motion for a resolution.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 58  
tabled by Mr Adonnino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 26 (3), 1st subparagraph (new)

Add the following before the first subparagraph:

'Once the general debate and consideration of the texts have been concluded, explanations of vote shall be permitted, before the matter as a whole is put to the vote, only on the following conditions'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 59  
tabled by Mr Galland and Mr Nord  
on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group

## RULES OF PROCEDURE

### Rule 14

This rule to read as follows:

1. A debate and vote on a report that does not meet the conditions stipulated in Rule 13 or on a matter that has not been considered beforehand by the appropriate committee may only be held under the urgent procedure.
2. A proposal that a debate be treated as urgent may be made by the President, the Commission, the Council and, in the case of a report which does not meet the conditions stipulated in Rule 13, by the appropriate committee. Such proposals shall be notified to Parliament and distributed to Members in writing and supported by reasons. The vote on the proposal shall be taken at the beginning of the sitting immediately following the sitting during which the text of the proposal was distributed to Members. At their request the mover to the proposal and one speaker against it shall be heard before the vote is taken, in each case for a maximum of three minutes. The decision to treat a matter as urgent shall require the votes of a majority of those present but not less than one third of Parliament's Members.
3. A request, given in writing and supported by reasons, that a debate be treated as urgent may be made by Members or groups of Members. Where such a request is declared admissible by the President, it shall be notified to Parliament and displayed in a fixed and visible place in the Chamber to be signed by any Members wishing to do so. If the request is signed by at least one third of the Members of Parliament or by the chairmen of at least four political groups, the debate shall be automatically declared urgent and the president shall accordingly inform Parliament.
4. Questions to be dealt with by urgent procedure shall be placed at the beginning of the agenda of the last day of the part-session in progress. In special cases of extreme urgency the President may rule that the debate shall be held earlier.
5. The debate shall be introduced by the person making the request for urgent procedure or in the case of a report that does not meet the conditions stipulated in Rule 13, by an oral report on behalf of the appropriate committee. It shall be conducted in accordance with the same rules applicable to other debates. The vote shall be taken immediately after the debate.
6. A request that a debate be treated as urgent may not relate to a subject that already appears on the agenda of the part-session in progress or has been considered by Parliament at one of its two preceding part-sessions. The President shall ascertain whether the request for urgent procedure meets this requirement and shall make the final ruling on its admissibility.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 60  
tabled by Mr Galland and Mr Nord  
on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group

## RULES OF PROCEDURE

### Rule 26 (3) 5th subparagraph:

This subparagraph to read as follows:

'After any final statements by the political groups, but before the final vote, Members may give oral explanations of vote which shall last for not more than one and a half minutes'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 61  
tabled by Mr Galland and Mr Nord  
on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3) 6th subparagraph

Replace the words

'taking account of the situation'...

by

'where the President deems it absolutely necessary in the light of the progress of Parliament's work, he may'...

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 62  
tabled by Mr Galland and Mr Nord  
on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3) 7th subparagraph

Delete this subparagraph.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 63  
tabled by Mr Galland and Mr Nord  
on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3) 8th subparagraph

This subparagraph to read as follows:

'Where the president has taken the decision referred to in the sixth subparagraph, or where Members have failed to meet the time-limit stipulated in the first subparagraph, the Members concerned may ask for a written explanation of vote not exceeding 150 words to be annexed to the verbatim report of proceedings, provided that their text is submitted within twenty-four hours of the final vote referred to in the third subparagraph'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 64  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3):

Read as follows:

'3. *Following the general debate, amendments, if any, shall be presented and explained.*

*Members who have tabled amendments shall have a prior right to speak for a maximum of three minutes on each amendment.*

*When this stage is completed the President shall announce the commencement of the vote.*

*Members may give explanations of vote prior to the vote on individual provisions or proposals.*

*The rapporteur shall give an opinion on the amendments before they are put to the vote.*

*Prior to the vote on the text as a whole, Members may give explanations of vote lasting for not more than five minutes.*

*No Member may interrupt the vote except to put a procedural motion referring to the conduct of the vote itself.*

*Members who so request twelve hours before the completion of the vote may have a written explanation of vote not exceeding 300 words annexed to the verbatim report of proceedings.*

*Once the result of the vote has been announced, no further discussion shall be allowed on the matter on which the vote has been taken.*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 65  
tabled by Mr Pannella

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), second subparagraph

Delete the subparagraph: 'Requests . . . . the first explanation of vote has commenced.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 66  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), second subparagraph ('Requests . . . . the first explanation of vote has commenced')

Delete the words 'no longer'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 67  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), second subparagraph ('Requests . . . . the first explanation of vote has commenced')

Delete the word 'oral'

\* \* \*



Amendment No. 68  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), third subparagraph

After the word 'After' add the words: *'the introduction of the speeches and'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 69  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), third subparagraph

For 'each political group' read *'each Member'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 70  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), third subparagraph

Replace the final clause: 'each political group etc. . . .'

by:

*'each political group may give ten explanations of vote and each non-attached Member may give one such explanation.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 71  
tabled by Mr Capanna

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), third subparagraph

Replace the final clause: 'each political group etc. . . .'

by:

*'five explanations of vote may be given by each group and by the non-attached Members.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 72  
tabled by Mrs Macciocchi

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), third subparagraph

Replace the final clause: 'each political group etc. . . '

by:

*'two explanations of vote may be given by each group and by the non-attached Members.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 73  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), third subparagraph

For 'make a statement' read *'give an explanation of vote'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 74  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), third subparagraph

Delete the words 'final statement'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 75  
tabled by Mrs Macciocchi

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), fourth subparagraph

Delete the subparagraph:

'Such a statement . . . . . three minutes'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 76  
tabled by Mr Capanna

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), first subparagraph

Delete the subparagraph: 'Requests . . . . . the third subparagraph opens.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 77  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), first subparagraph

For 'Requests . . . . . the third subparagraph opens' read:

*'Explanations of vote shall be given before the vote on individual provisions or proposals and before the final vote. The rapporteur shall give an opinion on the amendments before they are put to the vote.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 78  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), first subparagraph

For 'Requests . . . . . the third subparagraph opens' read:

*'Requests to give explanations of vote must be placed on the President's table before each vote opens.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 79  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), fifth subparagraph

Delete the words:

*'or written' and '(explanations of vote)'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 80  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), sixth subparagraph ('Taking account of the situation . . . . in writing')

Read as follows:

*'By way of strict exception and if there are no objections from the chairmen of the political groups or ten Members, the President may decide that the explanations of vote shall be given in writing.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 81  
tabled by Mr Capanna

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), eighth subparagraph  
Delete the subparagraph:  
'Members who fail . . . the final vote on the text'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 82  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), ninth subparagraph  
Delete the subparagraph:  
'The sole purpose of . . . . the voting behaviour of a Member'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 83  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), tenth subparagraph  
Delete the subparagraph:  
'Explanations of vote . . . . on procedural motions'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 84  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), tenth subparagraph ('Explanations of vote . . . on procedural motions')  
Delete the word '*not*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 85  
tabled by Mr Capanna

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), tenth subparagraph  
New text  
'Explanations of vote shall be admissible before votes on procedural motion.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 86  
tabled by Mrs Macciocchi

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 26 (3)

This paragraph to read as follows:

'3. *Members may table and speak on amendments after the general debate.*

*Those tabling amendments shall have the right to speak first and for not more than three minutes on each amendment.*

*The President shall then announce the beginning of the vote.*

*Members may give explanations of vote before the vote on individual provisions or amendments.*

*The rapporteur shall give his opinion on the amendments before they are put to the vote.*

*Before the vote on the text as a whole members may give explanations of vote lasting not more than three minutes each.*

*No-one may interrupt the voting except to table a procedural motion concerning the conduct of the vote.*

*Members may have an explanation of vote not exceeding 300 words annexed to the verbatim report of proceedings, provided that they request that this be done within 12 hours of the end of the vote.*

*After the result of the vote has been announced the debate on the matter just put to the vote may not be re-opened.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 87  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 14 (6)

Delete the words 'at the voting time following the debate' and replace them with the words 'at the end of the debate'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 88  
tabled by Mr Pannella

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 14 (6)

Read as follows:

'6. *Questions to be dealt with by urgent procedure shall be given priority over other items on the agenda and shall be debated within 24 hours if they have been approved by a majority of three-quarters of those voting. Where the decision to treat a matter as urgent is taken by a simple majority, the matter shall be accorded a place for debate at the discretion of the President during the same part-session. The vote on the substance itself shall be taken at the voting time following the debate.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 89  
tabled by Mr Capanna

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (6)

Read as follows:

'6. Questions *to be dealt with by urgent procedure shall be given priority over other items on the agenda and shall be debated within 24 hours if they have been approved by a majority of two-thirds of those voting. Where the decision to treat a matter as urgent is taken by a simple majority, the matter shall be accorded a place for debate at the discretion of the President during the same part-session.* The vote on the substance itself shall be taken at the voting time following the debate.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 90  
tabled by Mrs Macciocchi and Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (5) and (6)

Restore the existing text of Rule 14 (3) and (4).

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 91  
tabled by Mrs Bonino and Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (3)

Restore the existing text of Rule 14 (2).

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 92  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (1)

Delete the word *only*.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 93  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14

This Rule to read as follows:

'1. *Parliament may not debate or vote on subjects which are not on the agenda.*

2. *For Parliament to debate or vote on subjects which are not on the agenda, a decision by secret ballot and by a majority of three-quarters of those voting shall be necessary. A request to this effect may be made by the chairman of a group or by ten Members, only at the beginning of the sitting or when a new item on the agenda is about to be taken.*
3. *The person making the request, one speaker in favour and one speaker against may be heard for a maximum of three minutes.*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 94  
tabled by Mr Capanna

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 14

This Rule to read as follows:

1. A request that a debate be treated as urgent may be made to Parliament:
  - (a) by the President
  - (b) by the Commission or the Council
  - (c) by a Member, a group of Members, a political group or a committee.

A request for urgent debate shall relate to the inclusion of a report or a subject which is not on the agenda.

As soon as the President receives a request for urgent debate, he shall inform Parliament of the fact; the vote on that request shall be taken at the beginning of the next sitting.
2. Before the vote on a request for urgent debate, the person making the request, the chairman or rapporteur of the committee responsible, one speaker in favour and one speaker against the request may be heard, in each case, for a maximum of three minutes. Where there are several requests for urgent debate on the same matter they shall be dealt with in a single debate and a single vote.
3. Questions to be dealt with by urgent procedure shall be given priority over other items on the agenda if they have been adopted by a majority of two-thirds of those voting, if approved by a simple majority they shall be placed on the agenda of the same part-session and accorded a place for urgent debate at the discretion of the President. The vote on a motion for a resolution tabled under urgent procedure shall be taken at the voting time following the debate.
4. An urgent debate may be held without a report or on the basis of an oral report by the appropriate committee.
5. Rules 28 and 36A (4) shall not apply to the organization of a debate by urgent procedure.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 95  
tabled by Mr Pannella

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 14

This Rule to read as follows:

1. A request that a debate be treated as urgent may be made to Parliament:
  - (a) by the President
  - (b) by the Commission or the Council

(c) by a Member, a group of Members, a political group or a committee.

A request for urgent debate shall relate to the inclusion of a report or a subject which is not on the agenda.

As soon as the President receives a request for urgent debate, he shall inform Parliament of the fact; the vote on that request shall be taken at the beginning of the next sitting.

2. Before the vote on a request for urgent debate, the person making the request, the chairman or rapporteur of the committee responsible, one speaker in favour and one speaker against the request may be heard, in each case, for a maximum of three minutes.
3. Questions to be dealt with by urgent procedure shall be given priority over other items on the agenda and shall be debated within twenty-four hours if they have been adopted by a majority of three-quarters of those voting.

When a decision to treat a debate as urgent has been taken by a simple majority of those voting, it shall be included on the agenda for the same part-session and accorded a place for debate at the discretion of the President.

Before the opening of an urgent debate decided by a simple majority, the President shall ascertain that at least ten signatories of the request are present. If this number is not present the debate shall not be held.

4. The vote on a motion for a resolution tabled under urgent procedure shall be taken at the voting time following the debate.
5. An urgent debate may be held without a report or on the basis of an oral report by the appropriate committee.
6. Rules 28 and 36A (4) shall not apply to the organization of a debate by urgent procedure.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 96  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

## RULES OF PROCEDURE

### Rule 14

This rule to read as follows:

1. *A request that the debate be treated as urgent may be made to Parliament by the President, by at least 10 Members, by the Commission or by the Council. This request shall be in writing and supported by reasons.*

*As soon as the President receives a request for urgent debate, he shall inform Parliament of the fact; the vote on that request shall be taken at the beginning of the next sitting.*

2. *Where a request for urgent debate relates to the placing of a report on the agenda, only the person making the request, one speaker in favour, one speaker against, and the chairman or rapporteur of the committee responsible may be heard, in each case for a maximum of three minutes.*

*In all other cases one member from each political group and two non-attached Members may also be heard, for a maximum of three minutes each, unless they have already spoken on that request for urgent debate.*

3. *Questions to be dealt with by urgent procedure shall be given priority over other items on the agenda if they have been adopted by a majority of three-quarters of those voting; if they have been adopted by a simple majority they shall be included on the agenda of the same part-session and accorded a place for debate at the discretion of the President. The vote on a motion for a resolution tabled under urgent procedure shall be taken at the voting time following the debate.*
4. *An urgent debate may be held without a report or on the basis of an oral report by the appropriate committee.*
5. *Rules 28 and 36A (4) shall not apply to the organization of a debate by urgent procedure.*

\* \* \*



Amendment No. 97  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

## RULES OF PROCEDURE

### Rule 14

This rule to read as follows:

- '1. *A request that the debate be treated as urgent may be made to Parliament by the President, by at least 10 Members, by the Commission or by the Council. This request shall be in writing and supported by reasons.*  
  
*The request for an urgent debate shall relate to the inclusion of a report or a subject which is not already on the agenda. Requests relating to subjects discussed under urgent procedure during the preceding part-session shall not be admissible.*
2. *As soon as the President receives a request for urgent debate, he shall inform Parliament of the fact; the vote on that request shall be taken at the beginning of the next sitting.*  
  
*The person making the request, the chairman or rapporteur of the committee responsible, one member per political group and two non-attached Members may be heard, in each case, for a maximum of three minutes unless they have already spoken on that request for urgent debate. Where there are several requests for urgent debate on the same matter they shall be dealt with in a single debate and a single vote.*
3. *Questions to be dealt with by urgent procedure shall be given priority over other items on the agenda and shall be debated within 24 hours if they have been approved by a majority of three-quarters of those voting.*  
  
*Where a decision to treat a debate as urgent is made by a simple majority of those voting the President shall place the matter on the agenda of the same part-session and accord a place for debate at his discretion. Before the beginning of a debate for which urgent procedure has been decided by a simple majority, the President shall ascertain that at least 10 signatories of the request are present. Should this number not be present the debate shall not be held.*
4. *The vote on a motion for a resolution tabled under urgent procedure shall be taken at the voting time following the debate.*
5. *An urgent debate may be held without a report or on the basis of an oral report by the appropriate committee.*
6. *Rules 28 and 36A (4) shall not apply to the organization of a debate by urgent procedure'.*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 98  
tabled by Mrs Macciocchi

## RULES OF PROCEDURE

### Rule 14

This rule to read as follows:

- '1. *A request that the debate be treated as urgent may be made to Parliament by the President, by at least 10 Members, by the Commission or by the Council. This request shall be in writing and supported by reasons.*  
  
*As soon as the President receives a request for urgent debate, he shall inform Parliament of the fact; the vote on the request shall be taken at the beginning of the next sitting.*
2. *Where a request for urgent debate relates to the placing of a report on the agenda, only the person making the request, one speaker in favour, one speaker against, and the chairman or rapporteur of the committee responsible may be heard, in each case for a maximum of three minutes.*  
  
*In all other cases one member from each political group and two non-attached Members may also be heard, for a maximum of three minutes each, unless they have already spoken on that request for urgent debate.*

*Where there are several requests for urgent debate on the same matter they shall be dealt with in a single debate and a single vote.*

3. *Questions to be dealt with by urgent procedure shall be given priority over other items on the agenda if they have been approved by a majority of two-thirds of those voting; if they have been approved by a simple majority they shall be included on the agenda of the same part-session and accorded a place for a debate at the discretion of the President.*

*The vote on a motion for a resolution tabled under urgent procedure shall be taken at the voting time following the debate.*

4. *An urgent debate may be held without a report or on the basis of an oral report by the appropriate committee.*
5. *Rules 28 and 36A (4) shall not apply to the organization of a debate by urgent procedure.*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 99

tabled by Mrs Bonino, Mr Pannella and Mrs Macciocchi

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (1) and (2)

Delete paragraph 1 and replace paragraph 2 with paragraph 1 of the existing text of the Rules of Procedure

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 100

tabled by Mr Capanna

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (1)

Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 101

tabled by Mr Pannella

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (3)

Read as follows:

3. *As soon as the President receives a request for urgent debate, he shall inform Parliament of the fact; the debate and the vote on that request shall be taken at the beginning of the next sitting. Where there are several requests for urgent debate on the same matter they shall be dealt with in a single debate and a single vote.*

*During the debate on the request for urgent debate the person making the request, one Member per political group and two non-attached Members may be heard, in each case, for a maximum of three minutes.*

*The chairman or rapporteur of the committee responsible may state their views.*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 102  
tabled by Mr Capanna

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (3)  
Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 103  
tabled by Mr Capanna

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (5)  
Delete this paragraph

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 104  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (5), second subparagraph  
Delete the subparagraph '*A vote by etc . . .*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 105  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (5), second subparagraph  
Delete the word '*only*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 106  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (6)  
Delete the phrase '*and accorded a place for urgent debate at the discretion of the President*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 107  
tabled by Mrs Macciocchi

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14, paragraph 6a (new)

Add the following paragraph.

*'6A. Before the opening of an urgent debate included on the agenda of the last sitting of a part-session, the President shall ascertain that at least ten signatories of the request are present. If this number is not present the debate shall not be held.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 108  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14, paragraph 6b (new)

*'6b. The provisions of Rules 28 and 36A (4) shall not apply to the organization of a debate by urgent procedure.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 109  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (3)

Read as follows:

*'3. As soon as the President receives a request for urgent debate, he shall inform Parliament of the fact; the debate and the vote on that request shall be taken at the beginning of the next sitting. Where there are several requests for urgent debate on the same matter, they shall be dealt with in a single debate and in a single vote.*

*Where a request for urgent debate relates to the placing of a report on the agenda, only the person making the request, one speaker in favour, one speaker against and the chairman or the rapporteur of the committee responsible may be heard, in each case for a maximum of three minutes.*

*In all other cases the spokesmen of the political groups may also be heard, at their request, and for a maximum of three minutes each, unless they have already spoken on that request for urgent debate.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 110  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 31A

Read as follows:

*'No Member may speak for more than three minutes on any of the following: the minutes of proceedings, procedural motions, alterations to the draft agenda or to the agenda, personal state-*

*ments, the introduction of amendments, the amendments themselves, explanations of vote on individual provisions or proposals and on the text as a whole'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 111  
tabled by Mr Pannella

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 31A

Read as follows:

*'No Member may speak for more than five minutes on any of the following: the minutes of proceedings, procedural motions, alterations to the draft agenda or to the agenda, personal statements, the introduction of amendments, the amendments themselves, explanations of vote on individual provisions or proposals and on the text as a whole'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 112  
tabled by Mr Capanna

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 31A

Read as follows:

*'No Member may speak for more than three minutes on any of the following: the minutes of proceedings, procedural motions, amendments to the draft agenda or to the agenda, personal statements, the introduction of amendments and the amendments themselves. Explanations of vote may not exceed five minutes.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 113  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 31A

Reinstate Rule 31A of the Rules of Procedure, but delete the phrase 'unless Parliament decides otherwise'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 114  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

##### Rule 14

Reinstate the present text of this Rule, replacing 'twenty-one' by 'ten'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 115  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (1)  
No change in the English text

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 116  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)  
After the word 'majority' add '*of four-fifths*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 117  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)  
After the word 'majority' add '*of three-quarters*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 118  
tabled by Mr Capanna

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)  
After the word 'majority' add '*of two-thirds*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 119  
tabled by Mrs Macciocchi

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)  
After the word 'majority' add '*of three-fifths*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 120  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)

Delete the words 'being not less than one-third of its Members'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 121  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)

Replace '21 Members' by '1 Member'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 122  
tabled by Mr Capanna

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)

Replace '21' by '5'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 123  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)

Replace the words 'at least twenty-one Members' by '*at least ten Members or a group.*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 124  
tabled by Mrs Macciocchi

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)

Replace '21' by '10'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 125  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)

Delete the last sentence 'The request for urgent debate ..... given in writing.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 126  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)

Replace the last sentence 'The request for urgent debate ..... given in writing'  
by '*The request shall be made in writing and supported by reasons.*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 127  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)

The last sentence to read as follows:

'The request for debate, *put forward by the Members*, shall be accompanied by a motion for a resolution which shall contain the substance of the matter; it shall be submitted in writing and supported by reasons given in writing.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 128  
tabled by Mrs Macciocchi

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)

Add the following new paragraph at the end of Rule 14 (2):

'*The request for urgent debate shall relate to the entry on the agenda of a matter or report which does not already appear on it.*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 129  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)

Add the following new paragraph at the end of Rule 14 (2):



*'Requests relating to matters discussed by urgent procedure at the previous part-session shall not be admissible.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 130  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (2)

Add the following new paragraph at the end of Rule 14 (2):

*'Motions for resolutions amending the Rules of Procedure may not be the subject of a request for urgent debate.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 131  
tabled by Mrs Macciocchi

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (3)

Reinstate the existing text of Rule 14 (2) of the Rules of Procedure adding after the words 'spokesmen of the political groups' the following:

*'and two non-attached Members.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 132  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (4)

This paragraph to read as follows:

*'4. A request that a debate be treated as urgent may be contested by any Member in the Chamber. In such event, the President shall allow the author of the request, one speaker in favour and one against to be heard, in each case for a maximum of three minutes. One Member of each political group and two non-attached Members may also be heard, at their request, for a maximum of three minutes each.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 133  
tabled by Mr Capanna

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (4)

This paragraph to read as follows:

'A request that a debate be treated as urgent may be contested *by any Member in a written statement* to the President. In such event, the President shall allow *the author of the statement, one speaker in favour and one against* to speak for a maximum of three minutes each.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 134  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (5) and (6)

Reinstate the present text of Rule 14 (3) and (4), *deleting* in paragraph 3 the words 'accorded a place for urgent debate at the discretion of the President.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 135  
tabled by Mr Pannella

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (5), first paragraph

Delete.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 136  
tabled by Mr Pannella

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (5), second paragraph

This paragraph to read as follows:

'*In principle* a vote by roll call pursuant to Rule 35 *shall be taken* by means of the electronic voting system.'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 137  
tabled by Mr Pannella

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (5), second paragraph

After 'Rule 35' and '(4)'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 138  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 14 (6)

The first sentence to read as follows:

'6. Matters to be dealt with by urgent procedure shall be placed on the agenda of the part-session during which the urgency has been adopted, *in the order in which they have been approved.*'

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 139  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3)

Reinstate the present text of the Rules of Procedure.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 140  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3)

*Reinstate* the present text of the Rules of Procedure, but delete the word '*only*' in paragraph 3.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 141  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), first subparagraph

Delete the word '*oral*'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 142  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), first subparagraph

Delete the words '*final*' and '*referred to in the third subparagraph*'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 143  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), first subparagraph

Substitute *'the vote on the matter as a whole'* for 'the final vote'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 144  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), second subparagraph

This subparagraph to read as follows:

*Before the vote requests to give explanation of vote shall always be admissible.*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 145  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), third subparagraph

Delete

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 146  
tabled by Mr Capanna

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), fourth subparagraph

This subparagraph to read as follows:

Such a statement may not exceed *five* minutes.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 147  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), fourth subparagraph

Substitute *'four'* for 'three'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 148  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), fourth subparagraph

This subparagraph to read as follows:

Such statements may not exceed three minutes.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 149  
tabled by Mrs Macciocchi

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), fifth subparagraph

Delete

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 150  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), fifth subparagraph

This subparagraph to read as follows;

*'Before every vote members may give explanations of vote.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 151  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), fifth subparagraph

This subparagraph to read as follows:

*'After the final statements but before the matter as a whole is put to the vote, individual members may give explanations of vote.'*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 152  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), sixth subparagraph

Delete this subparagraph.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 153  
tabled by Mr Capanna

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), sixth subparagraph

This subparagraph to read as follows:

*'By way of strict exception and if there are no objections from the chairmen of the groups, the President may decide that explanations of vote shall be restricted to a maximum of ten'.*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 154  
tabled by Mrs Macciocchi

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), sixth subparagraph

Add the following sentence:

*If at least 5 members object to this procedure, it may not be used by the President.*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 155  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), sixth subparagraph

Add the following new subparagraph:

*Any member who is deprived of his right to give an oral explanation of vote may lodge a complaint with the enlarged Bureau, which shall verify whether the conditions were really such as to prevent oral explanations of vote from being given in the usual way.*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 156  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), seventh subparagraph

Delete this subparagraph.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 157  
tabled by Mr Capanna

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), seventh subparagraph

This subparagraph to read as follows:

Oral explanations of vote shall last for not more than *five* minutes.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 158  
tabled by Mrs Macciocchi

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), seventh subparagraph

For 'one and a half minutes' read '*four minutes*'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 159  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), seventh subparagraph

This subparagraph to read as follows:

Oral explanations of vote shall last for not more than *three* minutes.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 160  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), eighth subparagraph

Delete the words 'who fail to meet the time limit stipulated in the first subparagraph'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 161  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), eighth subparagraph

For '150' read 500.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 162  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), eighth subparagraph  
For '150' read '300'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 163  
tabled by Mrs Macciocchi

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), eighth subparagraph  
Replace the words '150 words' with:  
'3 pages of 30 lines of 60 strokes on a typewriter'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 164  
tabled by Mr Pannella

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), eighth subparagraph  
Delete the words:  
'provided that their text . . . . final vote on the text'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 165  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), eighth subparagraph  
Add the following new subparagraph:  
'Any part of the text in excess of the prescribed length shall not be translated and shall be published only in the original language.'

\* \* \*



Amendment No. 166  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), ninth subparagraph

This subparagraph to read as follows:

*'The explanation of vote shall serve to explain the position that a member will adopt during a vote'.*

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 167  
tabled by Mr Capanna

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), ninth subparagraph

Substitute 'One of the purposes' for 'The sole purpose'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 168  
tabled by Mrs Macciocchi

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 26 (3), ninth subparagraph

Substitute 'One purpose' for 'The sole purpose'.

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 169  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

Motion for a resolution

Insert the following text before the first indent:

— having regard to Article 142 of the EEC Treaty

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 170  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

Motion for a resolution

Insert the following text after the second indent:

— having regard to Rule 38 (1) of the Rules of Procedure

\* \* \*

Amendment No. 171  
tabled by Mrs Bonino

Motion for a resolution

Replace the entire motion for a resolution by the following text:

*'The European Parliament,*

— whereas

- the profound political significance of the popular election of the European Parliament implies the need for new Rules of Procedure following a general and comprehensive re-drafting, to replace the former Rules which are still in force,
- the old Rules were the logical expression of a constitutional arrangement comparable with that existing in the pre-Orleanist French Chambers, in other words Rules embodying exclusively the powers of the ruling authority, and analagous in the Community context to those drawn up by the Council of Ministers and the Commission,
- the direct election of the 'new' Parliament by the people therefore implies the need for 'new' Rules of Procedure rather than an 'episodic' approach amounting to an inconsistent series of partial modifications dictated by the current political situation and the overriding political interest of the existing majority,
- the constitutional history of all countries and at all times has demonstrated that, whenever there are significant changes in the representative nature — not just the representatives — of parliaments, the intrinsic and natural requirements of the institution eventually generate a body of rules reflecting its new representative nature. This occurred in 1958 in the French Assemblies of the Fifth Republic, and in the last century, gradually — as is the British way — but with considerable impact, in the House of Commons, during the transition from 'dualist' parliamentary government to the single authority of 'prime ministerial government'. The same process occurred under the Weimar republic and with the review of the Rules of Procedure in Italy in 1971,

— noting that

- whereas all constitutional history shows that parliamentary rules are eventually adapted to the new political situation in parliaments, it appears that the European Parliament is to be unique in that its 'new role', now significantly enhanced in terms of democracy, is to be carried out with a new set of rules which, technically speaking, represent a considerable retrograde step from the existing rules,
- although the extension of the suffrage and the more democratic and liberal climate which it created led, in France, the United Kingdom, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands and Italy, to more liberal and democratic parliamentary procedures, and although the striking 'new factor' of the legitimate authority now invested by the European people in its representatives ought to create a more democratic and liberal climate within the European Parliament and in its institutional relations with the other Community organs, nevertheless certain misleading ambiguities regarding the nature of this progress and this broadening of the base of European Parliamentarianism have provoked dangerous trends,
- as is well known, many national constitutional orders give pride of place to the pursuit, through institutions and regulations, of workable government rather than to the representation of the people, thus deliberately sacrificing the latter principle,
- the European Parliament is not faced with problems of government, and its role is not to exercise executive power, or support that power, sometimes sacrificing some prerogatives, by providing a solid and effective majority safeguarded by institutional mechanisms,
- the equivalent aim to be pursued by the European Parliament is to be as representative as possible, for it will only be able to fulfil its potential role in history if it embodies, as an institution, the will of the European peoples and truly represents those peoples' political cultures,

— considering that

- it follows from the above that the political approach and procedures associated with parliaments 'ruled by the majority' are inappropriate to the role of the European Parliament,
- the only rules of procedure appropriate to the role of the European Parliament are those which ensure maximum representation. This does not mean simply favouring

the criterion of 'proportionality' at the expense of minorities, but stressing that 'procedural equality at the outset' is the essential precondition where procedural rules are concerned. Even if proportionality is a relatively acceptable criterion in constitutional systems which have to produce and support a government, procedural equality, without pre-established privileges of a procedural nature for the majority, is the fundamentally correct criterion to ensure maximum representation of European cultures, including the views of minorities, in our Parliament,

- it should be borne in mind that the majority elected to the European Parliament by popular suffrage consists of the same political and social forces which generally form the governments in the Member States. However, as these governments also appoint the Community executive, and form the Council of Ministers, the majority in our Parliament is thus an exact reflection of the 'ruling power', thereby exemplifying an historical and political (and institutional) phenomenon which may justifiably be compared, historically speaking, with the beginnings of parliamentarianism personified (in England as elsewhere) by the 'King's party',
  - it is impossible today for a parliament directly elected by the European peoples with the specific aim of gaining independence from the 'ruling power' spontaneously to endow itself with a body of rules bestowing internal privileges on the 'King's party', just as Léon Gambetta or Clemenceau could not have proposed the Rules of Procedure for the imperial 'Corps Legislatif', or Gladstone and Disraeli the Standing Orders introduced in the 17th century, or Rathenau the parliamentary procedure of the Reichstag under Bismarck,
  - effective government in the sense of true representation also implies the attaching of lesser importance to the criterion of the primacy of the group ('groupocracy'),
  - it is inevitable in this day and age that the parliamentary group should take precedence over the individual Member, in cases where effective government is equated with stable government. It was hardly fortuitous that this trend emerged in the House of Commons at a time when it became necessary to strengthen the cabinet. However, the European Parliament, the function of which is certainly not to support cabinets, has no need for 'groupocracy',
  - on the contrary, its intrinsic need to ensure maximum representation means that the elected representatives should be granted increased opportunity to represent the people, and that Parliament should oppose excessive group discipline and, above all, the consolidation in the rules of the power of groups (particularly large groups), at the expense of individual Member's rights,
  - there is a dangerous fallacy in the specious argument that, in the event of an assembly of a given numerical size increasing its members, the size of the quorums fixed for the previous assembly should also be increased proportionately,
  - that argument would be valid if the practical functions and political role of the Assembly remained the same notwithstanding the increase in the number of its members. However, in the case of the European Parliament, there exists a clear historical and political distinction between the old and the new Assemblies which invalidates the criterion of proportionality;
1. Affirms its endorsement of the criterion of Parliament's 'new role', according to which minorities should not be made impotent but granted an increased opportunity to fulfil their representative function, while emphasizing that many of the national electoral systems used for the election of the European Parliament seriously prejudice the real interests of the people it is supposed to represent;
  2. Maintains that if this under-representation due to certain countries' electoral systems was compounded by under-representation in terms of parliamentary procedure, the political and cultural minorities of Europe, which have already been seriously victimized, would have no voice in our Parliament;
  3. Affirms its opposition to the reintroduction, in the free European Parliament of the 20th century, of the canon law rejected by the catholic church eight hundred years ago, according to which the majority was and should represent the 'sounder and more valiant part' of an Assembly;
  4. Decides to undertake a general review of its Rules of Procedure;
  5. Postpones consideration, in the meantime, of any existing amendment to the Rules of Procedure;
  6. Instructs the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions to commence work on this general review by setting up a working party which will consult competent international experts and take into account the experience of the national parliament.

## SITTING OF THURSDAY, 10 JULY 1980

## Contents

1. Approval of minutes:		Explanation of vote: Sir Peter Vanneck . . .	237
Mr Pannella . . . . .	213	Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	238
2. Documents received . . . . .	213		
3. Membership of committees . . . . .	213		
4. Decision on urgency:		11. Restructuring of the steel industry — Joint	
Mr Bangemann (L); Mr Sarre; Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mr Klepsch (EPP); Mr Baillot; Miss Forster; Mr Rinsche; Mr Pannella . . . . .	214	debate on an oral question (Doc. 1-296/80) by Sir Fred Catherwood and others on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, a report (Doc. 1-215/80) by Mr Peters on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and a report (Doc. 1-157/80) by Mrs Hoff on behalf of the Committee on Budgets:	
Point of order: Mr Fergusson . . . . .	216	Mr Peters, rapporteur (Doc. 1-215/80) . . . .	238
Mr Capanna; Mr Collins, Chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection; Mrs Scrivener; Mr Sherlock (ED); Mr Pannella; Mrs Seibel-Emmerling (S); Mr Klepsch (EPP); Ms Clwyd; Mr Provan (ED); Mrs Weber (S) . .	216	Point of order: Mr Albers . . . . .	239
Points of order: Mr Galland; Mr Sherlock . .	219	Mrs Hoff, rapporteur (Doc. 1-157/80) . . . .	239
5. Agenda:		Mr van Minnen (S); Mr Van der Gun (EPP); Mr Spencer (ED); Mr Ansart; Mr Calvez (L); Miss De Valera (EPD); Mrs Dekker; Mr Vetter; Mr Nordlohne; Mr Prag; Mr Petronio; Mr Oehler; Mr Konrad Schön; Mr Price; Mr Barbi; Mr Boyes; Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mr Simpson; Mr Seal; Mr Ingo Friedrich; Mr Abens; Sir John Stewart-Clark; Mr Vredeling; Vice-President of the Commission; Mr Colla . . . . .	240
Mr Prout; Mr Seeler; Mr Prout; Mr Collins, Chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection; Mr Janssen van Raay (EPP); Mr Johnson; Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets; Mr Blaney . . . . .	220	Points of order: Mr Barbi; Mr Nordlohne; Mrs Castle . . . . .	263
6. Preliminary draft budget of the Communities for 1981:		Mrs Dekker; Mr Vredeling; Mr Colla; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission; Mr Davignon; Mr Peters . . . .	264
Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission; Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets . . . . .	221		
Point of order: Mr Sutra . . . . .	225	12. Industrial products from third countries —	
7. Air traffic control system — Report (Doc. 1-274/80) by Mr Janssen van Raay on behalf of the Committee on Transport:		Motor vehicles, certain construction plant, textile names, electrical equipment and biodegradability; powered industrial trucks —	
Mr Janssen van Raay, rapporteur . . . . .	226	Joint debate on two reports (Docs. 1-236/80 and 1-141/80) by Mr von Wogau and a report (Doc. 1-224/80) by Mr de Ferranti:	
Mr Albers (S); Mr Noténboom (EPP); Mr Cottrell (ED); Mr Carossino; Mr Berkhoutwer (L); Miss Roberts; Mr Martin; Mr Moorhouse; Mr Combe; Mr Seefeld, Chairman of the Committee on Transport; Mr Burke, Member of the Commission . . . .	228	Mr Von Wogau, rapporteur (Docs. 1-236/80 and 1-141/80) . . . . .	267
Points of order: Mr van Minnen (S); Mr Peters; Mrs Hoff; Mrs Wiczorek-Zeul . . . .	236	Mr de Ferranti, rapporteur (Doc. 1-224/80) . .	269
8. Verification of credentials . . . . .	237	Mr Moreland, draftsman of an opinion . . . .	270
9. Urgent procedure . . . . .	237	Mr Turner (ED); Mr Delorozoy (L); Mr Nyborg (EPD); Mrs Hammerich; Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission; Mr de Ferranti on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs; Mr von Wogau . . . . .	271
10. Votes:		13. Integration of railway undertakings —	
Janssen van Raay report (Doc. 1-274/80): Air traffic control system:		Report (Doc. 1-267/80) by Mr Cottrell on behalf of the Committee on Transport:	
		Mr Cottrell, rapporteur . . . . .	277

- Mr Albers (S); Mr Janssen van Raay (EPP); Mr Moorhouse (ED); Mr Carossino (COM); Mrs Le Roux; Mr Burke, Member of the Commission* . . . . . 278
14. *Projects of Community interest in transport infrastructure — Report (Doc. 1-218/80) by Mr Buttafuoco on behalf of the Committee on Transport:*  
*Mr Buttafuoco, rapporteur* . . . . . 283  
*Mr Albers (S); Mr Janssen van Raay (EPP); Mr Moreland (ED); Mr Martin (COM); Mr Carossino; Mr Turner; Mr Burke, Member of the Commission* . . . . . 284
15. *Implementation of the 1979 budget — Report (Doc. 1-275/80) by Mr Aigner on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control:*  
*Mr Aigner, rapporteur* . . . . . 289  
*Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission; Mr Colla (S); Mr Irmer (L); Mr Aigner; Mr Tugendhat* . . . . . 290
16. *Budgetary control aspects of the Computer Centre — Interim report (Doc. 1-283/80) by Mr Kellett-Bowman on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control:*  
*Mr Kellett-Bowman, rapporteur* . . . . . 295  
*Mr Notenboom (EPP); Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission; Mr Kellett-Bowman* . . . . . 296
17. *Situation of refugees in the Horn of Africa — Report (Doc. 1-289/80) by Mr Marshall on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation:*  
*Mr Marshall, rapporteur* . . . . . 299  
*Mr Griffiths (S); Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission; Mr Michel (EPP); Sir Fred Warner (ED); Mr Coppeters; Mr Marshall; Mr Cheysson* . . . . . 299
18. *Membership of Parliament* . . . . . 304
19. *Agenda for next sitting* . . . . . 304

IN THE CHAIR: MR KATZER

*Vice-President*

*(The sitting was opened at 10 a.m.)*

**President.** — The sitting is open.

#### 1. *Approval of minutes*

**President.** — The minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting have been distributed.

Are there any comments?

I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Mr President, Item 10 in the Italian version of the minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting states:

Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets, and Mr Pannella spoke.

Since the reason for my speaking is not given, I want it made clear that I was speaking on a point of order. In actual fact, I was pointing out that Mr Lange could not utter the statement he was making because the committee had not met and it was therefore impossible

for him to say before the event that the proposals for rejection had been considered by the committee.

**President.** — Mr Pannella, exactly what you said is contained in the report of proceedings.

Since there are no further comments, the minutes of proceedings are approved.

#### 2. *Documents received*

**President.** — I have received various documents, details of which will be found in the minutes of proceedings.

#### 3. *Membership of committees*

**President.** — I have received from the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) a request that Mr Salzer be appointed as member of the European Parliament delegation to the Joint Parliamentary Committee of the EEC-Greece Association. From the Group of European Progressive Democrats I have received a request that Mr Doublet be appointed as member of the Committee on Transport.

Since there are no objections, these appointments are ratified.

#### 4. *Decision on urgency*

**President.** — The next item is the decision on the urgency of four motions for resolutions.

We shall begin with the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-311/80) by Mr Sarre and others: Future of the car industry.*

I call Mr Bangemann.

**Mr Bangemann.** — (D) On behalf of my group I wish to speak against the urgency of this motion. It reveals quite clearly the ambitions of those Members who yesterday threw out the proposals by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions and who are tabling motions of this kind today. They do not want to let Parliament get on with its work in a sensible manner but just want some window dressing, albeit of a pretty ghastly style. If we are going to react in this way every time a Member of the Commission says something we do not like, we are never going to be able to get on with our work, Mr President. This is not to say — I can see that the Commissioner is eager to speak — that I do not share the opinion in this motion on what the Commission said. It merely means that we cannot react with requests for urgent debate every time a Member of the Commission makes some comment in Munich or Birmingham or wherever. It is simply not done.

**President.** — I call Mr Sarre.

**Mr Sarre.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, it is the view of the Socialist Members that the car industry in the Community is on the verge of a very serious crisis. Volkswagen sees no hope of improving its performance in 1980. The major constructor in Italy made considerable losses in 1979. In the United Kingdom 6 000 workers at British Leyland's Scottish factories are working one week in two, while in France the Minister for Industry is beginning to count the cutbacks in jobs. Short-time working is becoming the rule. It is apparent that it is absolutely vital for the Community to do something and come up with an emergency plan to safeguard our car industries. I have read in the press what Mr Davignon is supposed to have said. He told me yesterday that some of his comments had been misreported and some he had not even said. . .

**Mr Galland.** — (F) Check your sources before putting pen to paper!

**Mr Sarre.** — (F) Point taken.

Be that as it may, the Socialist Group agreed last night to withdraw this motion for a resolution with request

for urgent debate and to reintroduce it in accordance with Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure, after the deletion of the first and second paragraphs which criticize Mr Davignon's comments. It goes without saying that we want a programme to be drawn up and discussed. In reply to the honourable Member who said just now that sources should be checked before putting pen to paper, let me say that until we have proof to the contrary that is what we do. Because of translation problems this could not be done. Naturally, if I am told that someone did not do or did not say something, I do not see why I should accuse him when he denies it. However, I hope that after the holidays we shall have a wide-ranging debate on this matter, because urgent measures are really needed. I am convinced that most of the Members here share my view, which is that we have to safeguard this industry and those who work in it.

**President.** — I call Mr Davignon.

**Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission.** — (F) Mr President, there are in fact two aspects to this problem: firstly, what I am supposed to have said or not said in Munich, and secondly, the underlying issue.

I thank Mr Sarre for his words this morning which confirm our conversation of yesterday evening. I told him in fact that, as far as my speech in Munich was concerned, I am certain I kept strictly to the text because it was delivered in German. And whenever I speak German, I read every word.

(Laughter)

When I speak other languages, there are times when I get carried away and misunderstandings can creep in. In Munich, however, I was especially certain about what I was saying. I said nothing about cars in Munich. I have the text here, drafted in impeccable German, and there is no mention of cars. We can therefore clear up that misunderstanding.

As for the underlying issue, the misunderstanding is especially regrettable because at the last meeting of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, which I was privileged to attend, I said that I would supply the committee after the holidays in September with a review of the situation in the car industry. We would use this as a starting-point to discuss all the aspects of the matter which are clearly of prime importance for the European economy and which the Community will use as a basis to determine the package of measures which will be required if our car industry is to remain as it is.

The Commission, acting in the spirit of competition which it has always cherished, outlined what it intended to do even before this motion for a resolution came up.

**Davignon**

Thank you, Mr President, for letting me play a brief part in this debate.

**President.** — I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I want to say briefly on behalf of my group that we are against urgency. The subject is already down to be discussed by the committee and we are expecting a report on it in September. I can mention in passing that both our group and Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti have submitted documents on this matter. I hardly think that the five minutes before one o'clock tomorrow are adequate for an urgent debate about the European car industry, and the author of this motion knows it too. I ask for urgent procedure to be rejected.

**President.** — I call Mr Baillot.

**Mr Baillot.** — (F) I do not think there is any point in my discussing the matter, Mr President, since if I have understood Mr Sarre correctly, he has withdrawn his request. I do not think there is any reason in voting for or against or abstaining. The essential points will be discussed, since Mr Davignon has said that a report is going to be submitted.

**President.** — I call Miss Forster.

**Miss Forster.** — Mr President, I would like to speak very briefly on behalf of my group. I would like to assure Mr Sarre that we feel considerable concern for not only the motor-trade industry but also the component-parts industry and the steel industry. They are all linked and we are concerned about the unemployment.

However, Mr President, an urgent debate is not the way to deal with this. We already have it on our agenda for next week in the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, when Mr Pininfarina's motion comes before us. That is the place to do it and I would like to support Viscount Davignon when he points out that he has already said to the committee that he is looking into the matter.

(Applause)

**President.** — As the request for urgent debate has been withdrawn, the motion for a resolution is referred to the appropriate committee.

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-312/80) by Mr Rinsche and others: Border incident between Vietnamese and Thai troops*. I call Mr Rinsche.

**Mr Rinsche.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I offer three reasons to support this request. Firstly, the urgency of this motion rests on the acute danger which threatens thousands of Cambodian refugees who will starve to death unless the land bridge is reopened. Secondly, the urgency of the motion also rests on the continuing threat of another war in Vietnam, the fifth. Everything we can do to avert such a catastrophe in southeast Asia must be done without delay. Thirdly, the European Parliament welcomed and approved the exemplary cooperation agreement between ASEAN and the European Community. Our partners in ASEAN now need some proof of our solidarity. I therefore urge you to vote in favour of urgent procedure.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Mr President, the Members on the right in this Parliament have acknowledged in all fairness that in the past year there has not been a single occasion when a request for urgency from the right, on issues of civil and human rights affecting any group of people, has not been supported by the Italian Radicals. On the other hand, we have occasionally been attacked by our comrades on the left because of our uncompromising attitude.

This morning — although not here in the Chamber — there has been a significant move on Afghanistan. In the next few weeks we shall be going to Cambodia, partly with an official delegation from this Parliament and partly with other Italian delegations. We are battling — you may recall — to put an end to this problem of hunger and the weapon of starvation used by the Russian aggressors and their henchmen.

I think it is time we took stock of the situation, Mr President. As we were in the thirties, we are now living in momentous times when never a week or a month goes by — and this was pointed out yesterday by that eminent correspondent of *Le Monde*, Fontaine — without those of a particular political persuasion attacking some country or another. Requests for urgency and hasty debates are not the way to cope with these events.

Listen, if we are going to do things properly, we have to stop arranging all these sudden debates like this. We have set out basic guidelines but we cannot carry on in this never-ending fashion. Instead of blindly applying Rule 28, let us have a special part-session for Parliament to deal with the problem of human and civil rights throughout the world, and especially these

**Pannella**

aggressive onslaughts by this new fascist power which is at work in the world.

For my own part, for the sake of consistency, I am ready to have a special part-session so that this Parliament can consider Afghanistan, Cambodia, Vietnam and all present or future aggressions. But let us stop trotting out the same old words in this meaningless fashion!

**President.** — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

Urgent procedure is adopted.

The motion for a resolution will be placed on the agenda of tomorrow's sitting.

I call Mr Fergusson on a point of order.

**Mr Fergusson.** — Mr President, may I propose that all three motions which are before us now on refugees in South-East Asia be taken together in the same debate tomorrow, because, although the refugees themselves may come from different countries, the issues involved are very much the same for us and it would be a pity to cover the same thing twice over?

**President.** — Thank you very much for your excellent suggestion.

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-313/80) by Mr Capanna and others: Seveso directive*.

I call Mr Capanna.

**Mr Capanna.** — (I) Mr President, at its sitting on 19 June last Parliament endorsed the report, drawn up by the Committee on the Environment, on the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a directive on accident hazards of certain industrial activities. On 30 June the Council, because of opposition by the government of one of the Member States, failed to adopt the directive which was proposed by the Commission and which has now come to be known as the Seveso directive. Parliament is now requested to call on the Council to adopt this directive without delay. I am aware of other moves in this direction, and they have my support.

This motion for a resolution with request for urgent debate does not run counter to the initiative by the Committee on the Environment but in fact lends

support to it. The urgency of the motions rests on the fact that until the Council approves this directive other incidents like Seveso and other ecological disasters such as those which happened before Seveso, in the United Kingdom in 1974 and in the Netherlands in 1975, could happen again at any time in any one of the nine Member States. It is no coincidence in my view that this request for urgency has been signed by 33 Members from almost all the political groups in this Parliament and that they include the chairmen of the Political Affairs Committee and the Legal Affairs Committee. I really hope that Parliament, anxious to protect the health of the people of Europe, will vote in favour of urgent debate for this motion.

**President.** — I call Mr Collins.

**Mr Collins, Chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.** — I must say that it is with some regret that I have to speak against urgent procedure for this particular matter. There is no doubt at all that this is an important resolution. There is no doubt at all that the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection was very, very disappointed when it read in the newspapers that the Council had failed to adopt this particular directive. And there is no doubt at all that our feelings in the committee were feelings about the irresponsibility of those who felt unable to support the terms of this directive. There is no doubt at all in our minds that the image of Seveso and its results will haunt those people who failed to rally round and support this particular proposal.

However, I would emphasize to the House this morning that this directive has not yet been rejected. It has merely not been adopted. And there is a significant distinction there to which I want to draw the House's attention. The clause in contention was a clause which referred to the transmission of information across national boundaries. One of the Member States felt unable to support that particular clause. The Council has referred it to COREPER and COREPER is instructed to produce a document to be put before the next Environment Council, which I understand is to take place on 21 October.

There was an emergency meeting of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection this week, Mr President, and that meeting of the committee instructed me, as chairman, to write to the President and ask her to communicate to the Council that we stand by this particular clause. We want to emphasize it. We want to make sure that the Council understands our very strong views in the matter.

The committee has also asked me to invite the President-in-Office of the Council to meet it to discuss this and other matters at a date probably in September.



**Collins**

We in the committee believe that Mr Capanna has the right to be concerned and he is absolutely right to bring this to the attention of the House. But I would say to the House that the matter is in hand and we are hopeful that the careful and considered approach that the committee has adopted is much more likely in fact to produce the results which Mr Capanna wants to see. Therefore, it is with regret that I have to say that I cannot support the request for urgent procedure and I think the House should not support urgent procedure but that, nonetheless, it should be sympathetic to the substance of Mr Capanna's motion.

**President.** — I call Mrs Scrivener.

**Mrs Scrivener.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I just want to second what was said by Mr Collins, chairman of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. I do not think this matter merits urgency, for all the reasons which Mr Collins so succinctly outlined a moment ago. In view of the fact that we have written to the President and in view of the Commission's stance, it would be better if we waited for the Council decision. I am quite certain it will be the right one, because this directive of course needs to be adopted.

**President.** — I call Mr Sherlock.

**Mr Sherlock.** — Mr President, I speak for my Group in opposing the adoption of urgent procedure for this motion. You have already heard most of the background admirably described by the chairman of the committee, Mr Collins, supported by Mrs Scrivener.

I would, however, take this opportunity to say that while my group, my committee and myself, personally, share the anger of this House at the cavalier way in which our great deliberations have been treated — in particular after the devoted work which Mrs Roudy put into the drafting of the report — I would, at the same time, denounce the hypocrisy of this House, where 33 people can sign such a motion when there were 12 in this Chamber when the subject which they consider so urgent was debated.

This is, in my opinion, carrying mealy-mouthed hypocrisy to its extreme! If they could have bothered to turn up — it was not even a Friday, Mr President, it was a Tuesday when we debated this to an empty House and put forward all these wonderful suggestions — they might even have modified the directive in such a way that it would have been acceptable to all the nine nations concerned.

The case for urgent procedure, for the reasons that have already been given, cannot be demonstrated here, because the most urgent steps are being taken to

ensure that a new, good directive — nearly four years after Seveso — might eventually be accepted by the Council. But to protest so much in this way and fail to attend is a lesson in how not to behave that I hope this House will learn from, so that it may act more carefully in future.

**President.** — I call Mr Pannella.

**Mr Pannella.** — (I) Mr President, I merely want to say that the arguments against urgency we have been hearing and those put forward by Mr Collins are in my view precisely the arguments which justify urgency. If we have a frank discussion based on viewpoints which are clear for the vast majority of the groups here, the discussion would be enhanced and this would be a good thing. I find it odd, however, that it should be one of the majority groups to accuse this Parliament of hypocrisy. If by hypocrisy you mean a policy, quit the hypocrisy on the majority side instead of getting on your high horse and making hypocritical references to hypocrisy. The reputation of those who signed this request for urgency is a guarantee of their integrity. Let me get to the point: apart from Mr Capanna, the motion was signed by Mr Pisani, Mrs Cassanmagnago Cerretti, Mr D'Angelosante, Mr Bettiza, Mrs Lizin, Mr Rumor, Mrs Spaak, Mr Purvis, Mr Van Minnen, Mr Gendebien, Mr Cecovini, Mr Muntingh, Mr Coppieters, Mrs Castellina, Mrs Macciocchi, Mrs Dekker, Mr De Goede, Mr Didò, Mr Bonaccini, Mr Macario, Mr Ferrero, Mr Veronesi, Mr Ippolito, Mrs Squarcialupi, Mrs Barbarella, Mr Ferri, Mr Puletti, Mr Blaney, Mr Filippi, Mr Ghergo and Mr Lima. Consequently, Mr President, unless every one of these 32 Members is considered a hypocrite or incompetent, it has to be acknowledged that they did the right thing in proposing urgency for the very reasons which were put forward by Mr Collins.

We have to be as firm as possible in the coming debates. For this reason my vote will be cast in favour of this request for urgency.

**President.** — I call Mrs Seibel-Emmerling.

**Mrs Seibel-Emmerling.** — (D) Thank you for calling me, Mr President, since I was the first to ask to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

Since the news of the Council's failure to adopt the directive on the hazards of major accidents, the Socialist Group has been stressing the vital importance it attaches to the adoption of the Seveso directive. The article contested by the French Government — the requirement to supply information to other Member States — is an indivisible part of the directive in our view, and we shall not yield on this point. We are very

**Seibel-Emmerling**

grateful to the rapporteur, Mrs Roudy, since it was at her instigation that this important section was incorporated in the report.

As soon as we heard that the directive had not been adopted in Luxembourg, we did what was immediately necessary. We called a special meeting of the relevant committee. At the meeting we determined what our position should be and decided to call for a debate under Rule 14 in this House unless our request was properly considered.

Since the committee was unanimous in confirming its decision to stick by the report and requested the presence of the Council for the next meeting, and since also the chairman of the Socialist Group, Mr Glinne, asked the President-in-Office here in Parliament about this directive and was told that the matter would be dealt with again, everything that the Parliament could possibly do at once was done. We are therefore against this request for an urgent debate.

**President.** — I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) I can be brief, Mr President, because Mrs Seibel-Emmerling has already made clear everything which I would have stated on behalf of my group. Everyone on the list Mr Pannella read out just now should be satisfied by the measures which the committee has already taken. In our opinion, this motion is just for show. Everything that had to be has been done.

**President.** — I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

The request is rejected.

The motion for a resolution will therefore be referred to the appropriate committee.

\*  
\*   \*

**President.** — We shall now consider the *motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-315/80) by Ms Clwyd and others on behalf of the Socialist Group: Air-conditioning systems.*

I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) Mr President, there is something I should like to say to Mr Glinne. I did this on the previous occasion. The substance of this request for urgency should have been put in a letter to the President. I am convinced, too, that this would have been a far speedier course to follow than seeking urgent procedure. For this reason — because I really cannot

see why such a text should be put before the House — we shall not be voting in favour of urgency.

**President.** — I call Ms Clwyd.

**Ms Clwyd.** — Could I tell Mr Klepsch that I wrote to the President two months ago on this very topic and I am not convinced that anything has been done about it, which is why I have chosen to raise the matter here in the House. I think it is important that it is raised before the summer recess because it is not an amusing topic as some Members seem to think but a very serious topic and the reason why I have raised it here today is that something should be done for the sake of both parliamentarians and staff and also to raise the problem more widely because air-conditioning systems are increasingly being installed in modern buildings without any thorough appreciation of the dangers which can arise. Moreover, increasing requests are being made by users of air-conditioning systems to investigate complaints of headaches, dry eyes, sore throats and general respiratory infections and to establish to what extent these symptoms could result from unclean and contaminated air, and if, Mr President, you were to take a straw poll of Members of Parliament and of staff, you would find that one in three, particularly during the Strasbourg week, complains of symptoms of this kind. In fact, according to research carried out with a sample of more than 1 300 office staff, half of whom worked in air-conditioned offices, absenteeism caused by lung and bronchial infections is 20 % higher among those working in air-conditioned areas. The researchers — and this has been the subject of considerable medical research recently — felt that the system of continuously recirculating air over humidifiers provided ideal breeding conditions for harmful bacteria and fungi. After an investigation recently carried out at the UK Health and Safety Executive into illness thought to be minor attacks of influenza, doctors concluded that many outbreaks are probably caused by amoebae breeding in the water reservoirs of air-conditioners. This followed investigations into a rayon factory in the United Kingdom which had to be closed down. This, my fellow-Members, is a serious problem and, as such, deserves your serious attention. Only in the last week, the World Health Organization has issued a statement pointing out that pollution within buildings is becoming even more serious than pollution outside. I would therefore urge the Members of this Parliament to take this subject seriously because it is something which causes considerable distress, not only to Members of Parliament, but also to members of staff and also to all users of air-conditioning systems.

It is important that we discuss this topic seriously because I believe that unless we do so, it is something which will cause considerable harm to the people who are obliged to work in air-conditioned atmospheres. A good example of the effects of air-conditioning

Clwyd

occurred in New York, just a few months ago, when staff who moved into a new office building complained of nausea, headaches, lethargy or light-headedness. A thorough investigation had to be made of the air-conditioning system and the office building had to be shut down. Duct work which is more than a year old is contaminated with dust, dirt, debris, bacterial cells and fungal spores so that, unless it is cleaned, air inside such buildings is often dirtier than air on the outside. Another reason why this problem should be investigated in this Parliament is because one of the problems is that this duct work is inaccessible to inspection. In one, by no means untypical, 46 000 square-foot office building recently surveyed, there was over half a mile of duct work but not one inspection panel. Mr President, it is important that Parliament takes this matter seriously because it is the cause of much damage to human health. The Socialist Group supports urgent procedure for this motion.

*(Laughter and protests from the right)*

**President.** — I call Mr Provan.

**Mr Provan.** — Mr President, I have never heard such a disgraceful abuse of the Rules of Procedure in this House. It is absolutely intolerable that we should be launched into a full-scale debate when what we are actually supposed to be discussing is a request for urgent debate. Now we oppose an urgent debate for entirely the same reasons as those Mrs Clwyd has mentioned. It is a vital issue which was the subject of a question I put to the Commission three months ago. The reply I got from the Commission was that this is indeed a serious problem and that as such it needs proper research. What we must do is refer this to the Committee on Energy and Research because of the energy-consumption of air-conditioning. We also need to refer the matter to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection. There must be proper research into this at European level. It is not a matter for urgent procedure. It needs cool, proper, clarified research so that we can in fact get the proper answer. We oppose urgent procedure.

**President.** — I call Mrs Weber.

**Mrs Weber.** — *(D)* At the risk of making you all laugh again, Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, let me say that you perhaps all have remarkably equipped vocal chords, which perhaps others in this Chamber have not been endowed with to the same extent. I think that this is a problem which really needs a solution, but I do not think that the Committee on Energy and Research is really the best place to deal with it, since air-conditioning systems are anything but energy-saving. If the problem is to be discussed, I think it is better to give it to the Committee on the

Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, of which I am a member.

I want to make a brief comment about procedure. It was months ago that we complained about the environment in this Chamber and we failed to convince anyone of the need for a debate. Apparently, however, the electronic voting lobby is much better than the people lobby in this Parliament, because when the system failed and it was found that this was caused by excessive dryness and static electricity as a result of the synthetic materials here in the Chamber, the level of humidity was increased like a shot and upped to a far higher level. If you ask me, this clearly shows that the humanization of work places often works very well for things and equipment, but no so well where people are concerned. For this reason I urge you to vote in favour of urgency, so that this problem can be dealt with during the summer holidays.

**President.** — I call Mr Galland on a point of order.

**Mr Galland.** — *(F)* Mr President, when someone asks to speak on a point of order, you cannot call other Members first, in order to speak against urgent procedure. You have to call him first. Another thing, Mr President. When someone stands up to speak in support of a motion with request for urgent procedure, you cannot let that person go on for six minutes and thirty seconds, more than double the proper time, and go into the substance of the matter. Can I ask you, Mr President, to observe the spirit and the letter of the Rules of Procedure?

**President.** — Mr Galland, I was a little indulgent towards the ladies and I hope you will forgive me.

I put to the vote the request for urgent procedure.

The request is rejected.

The motion for a resolution is therefore referred to the appropriate committee.

I call Mr Sherlock on a point of order.

**Mr Sherlock.** — Mr President, truly this has been — if I may venture to criticize the Chair — the most extraordinary display. First of all, to allow one of the speakers — no matter of what sex — to go over twice the permitted time, and then of failing to recognize and, in my case, having clearly given me a nod or recognition from the speaker's chair, of failing to call me to make my point of order. I must protest, Mr President, and in the strongest possible terms.

**President.** — I am sorry. I did not see you.

## 5. Agenda

**President.** — I call Mr Prout.

**Mr Prout.** — The Legal Affairs Committee met yesterday and asked me to withdraw my report from the agenda for further consideration in committee. Since the rapporteur is the servant to the committee, I have to exercise my right to withdraw the report under Rule 26 of the Rules of Procedure. I do this with the greatest regret.

**President.** — I call Mr Seeler.

**Mr Seeler.** — (D) Mr President, the rapporteur for a committee has indeed the right to withdraw his report under Rule 26. I should like to point out to the House, however, that we were told at the June part-session — by Mrs Veil in fact — that this item which has been with the committee for more than a year now was to be dealt with as a matter of priority at the July part-session. Pursuant to Rule 26(2), I should like Parliament to set a time-limit of two months for the submission of this report, so that it will at last be dealt with in September.

**President.** — I assume that the rapporteur also agrees to a time-limit of two months.

I call Mr Prout.

**Mr Prout.** — Well Mr President, since, as I said in my preliminary statement, I am the servant of my committee, I do not think I am in any position to commit my committee to the limit that Mr Seeler has suggested. The reason the report has been withdrawn from the House is because the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection has tabled an amendment to the substance of the matter. Now as you know, the report refers simply to a preliminary point of law. Now if the amendment tabled by the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection were to have been successful in the House, the consultation procedure of this House would have been completed without the Legal Affairs Committee having had a chance to address itself to matters of substance. Now I would imagine the committee will say that it is quite impossible to reproduce this report, on the floor of the House by September because it has not yet considered matters of substance. I am simply bringing a preliminary point of law to the House.

**President.** — I call Mr Collins.

**Mr Collins,** *Chairman of the Committee on Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection.* — Mr

President, I must say that I find it remarkable that Mr Prout should say that the committee has not yet considered matters of substance. The committee has indeed considered matters of substance and considered them at great length. In fact, after it had considered the matters of substance, an amendment was put down in the Legal Affairs Committee which not only resulted in a change of rapporteur, so that Mr Prout became rapporteur, but also changed the whole nature of the report which was coming before Parliament.

My concern here is that not only did the Legal Affairs Committee consider this at length, but so did my committee, insofar as it is concerned with consumer protection. I find it remarkable that only a month ago we were assured in this House that we would be able to consider this report in July. Now we are in July and it is withdrawn. It is up to Parliament, not just the committee and not just the rapporteur, to declare a timetable. I accept that Mr Prout cannot speak on behalf of his committee on this matter. Nonetheless, I believe that Parliament should fix a rigid timetable, because we cannot permit a situation in which this report keeps being postponed because certain people are afraid they might lose votes on the floor of the House. September may not be the correct time, because that is really one month away, not two, but I would urge that by autumn, or certainly early winter, we must have this back on the floor of the House.

**President.** — I call Mr Janssen van Raay.

**Mr Janssen van Raay.** — (NL) Mr President, the Legal Affairs Committee will be meeting for the first time on 23 and 24 September. This means that a time-limit of two months is simply not feasible. We are pleased that the rapporteur has exercised his right to have this matter referred to committee. If we want to set a time limit for having this dealt with in plenary sitting — and I have nothing against that — I should like to suggest a reasonable limit of, say, four months. Speaking as spokesman for the European People's Party, I feel that four months is a reasonable limit. I should have no objections if this were the decision.

**President.** — Everyone seems willing to bend over backwards on this matter. From what I hear, the rapporteur is quite happy if it takes months. Anyhow, we ought to meet Mr Seeler's request and discuss things as quickly as possible. The report is therefore referred to committee.

I call Mr Johnson.

**Mr Johnson.** — Mr President, can we take it that any report which is resubmitted by the Legal Affairs Committee to the House will deal with the substance

**Johnson**

of the matter and that we shall not be faced with another of these procedural and legalistic submissions? This time can we expect the substantive technical report?

**President.** — I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I am sorry if I have to get up again on account of the order of items on the agenda. It is common knowledge that the Commission intends to present the preliminary draft budget of the Communities for 1981 here in Parliament. We also know that Parliament has always insisted that this part of the budgetary authority and the other, the Council, be informed before the Commission discloses its preliminary draft budget to the public. I am aware that the Commission has arranged a press conference on the budget for noon. I am also aware that there are 14 Members down to speak on the first item on the agenda, the Janssen van Raay report. If we hear these 14 speakers now, we shall easily reach 12 o'clock. This will mean that Parliament is informed only after the Commission has spoken to the press. I therefore ask for the agenda to be changed, so that we bring forward the Commission statement and then deal with air traffic control.

**President.** — I call Mr Janssen van Raay.

**Mr Janssen van Raay.** — (NL) Mr President, in deference to the right of Parliament to hear the Commission statement before the press conference is held, as rapporteur I am willing to go along with Mr Lange's proposal.

**President.** — Since there are no objections, that is agreed.

I call Mr Blaney.

**Mr Blaney.** — Mr President, on item 124, which is included provisionally on the agenda for Friday morning, I wish, as rapporteur for the Committee on Agriculture on the proposals from the Commission to the Council on the common organization of the market in flax and hemp and measures to encourage the use of flax fibres, to withdraw the report under Article 26 (2) of the Rules of Procedure. I might add, just for the information of the House, that the reason I so request is that there is procedural disagreement within our committee about the status of the report, but it should not take very long to sort that out.

**President.** — The report is therefore referred back to committee.

## 6. *Preliminary draft budget of the Communities for 1981*

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the Commission statement on the preliminary draft budget of the European Communities for 1981.

I call Mr Tugendhat.

**Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, I should first like to thank Mr Lange for putting the proposal, Mr Janssen van Raay for agreeing to this short delay in his item, and you, Mr President, for granting my request to make this statement now.

The preliminary draft budget of the European Communities is an important event in the Community's year. The presentation of it is a difficult matter because it ought, in my view, to be presented first to Parliament. On the other hand, it is something which needs to be presented to the world at large and it is, of course, something which needs to be presented to the other arm of the budgetary authority as well. And if one is to ensure that Parliament is to come first in the batting order, there is a good deal of difficulty about timing, and I am extremely grateful to those people who have made it possible for us to stick to what I believe is the appropriate order for dealing with this matter.

Of course, the 1980 budget has only just been adopted and we are turning our attention to the 1981 budget less than 24 hours after the vote on the preceding year. It is, I think, the first time in the life of the Community that the preliminary draft budget for the following year has followed so closely on the adoption of the budget for the current year. The permanence of the inter-institutional debate on the budget is an unmistakable sign of the central role which the budget now plays in the life of our Community.

In submitting its preliminary draft budget now, the Commission is aware of the considerable delay which has thus been incurred. In the exceptional circumstances which we have just lived through, it would not have been wise to try to adhere at any price to the pragmatic timetable, according to which the preliminary draft budget has to be submitted on 15 June. Because of the uncertainties which surrounded the final outcome of the 1980 budget procedure, the Commission felt the need to wait until 9 July in order to finalize and formally adopt its proposals for 1981. In other words, we only finalized it yesterday. In doing so, the Commission has borne in mind the imperative obligation to adhere to the timetable laid down by the Treaty and place the preliminary draft budget before the Council and the Parliament before 1 September. In practice all the budget documents will have to be sent in all languages to the budget authority at the end of July.

### Tugendhat

So much for procedure which, given the rather special circumstances of this year, I thought it right to mention briefly.

I now want to turn to the substance of the 1981 budget. Before giving the House a broad outline of its contents, I want to review briefly the context in which it is being presented.

1981 will not be an easy year. It will not be an easy year for the economies of the Member States of the Community. Most, if not all, Member States are in recession and must face the challenge which recession confronts us with. The Community budget must make a proper contribution to surmounting that recession. At the same time the climate of restraint in public expenditure in the Member States means that we must be very certain that we are not guilty merely of throwing money at problems without regard to cost-effectiveness. The Commission has tried, in its proposals, to ensure as far as possible that where money is to be spent that it is well spent.

I say that the Commission has tried as far as possible to ensure that money is well spent, wisely. Because 1981 will be a difficult year in another sense. I think history will show that 1981 represented a major transition in the development of the Community. First we have the entry of the tenth member which is a European historic event very much to be welcomed and the 1981 budget makes appropriate financial provision both as regards expenditure and receipts for Greek membership.

This enlargement of the Community also occurs at a time when the Community's finances will be under review. The Commission will execute the mandate which it has been given by the Council to review the Community's finances and the balance of its policies as a matter of high priority and with all due speed. But let me make it clear: the Commission intends to do a thorough job, and to do a thorough job the Commission will need enough time. The Council has asked for proposals by June 1981, and the Commission will meet this deadline with proposals designed to ensure a sound financial and policy basis for the further enlargement of the Community on the one hand and the continued integration of the Community on the other. It will then be up to the budget authority to act; in this exercise all the European institutions will be called upon to play their full role.

Let me say at this juncture, in case there is any misunderstanding on the point, that the financing study must have as its goal, not the perpetuation of special arrangements in order to avoid the recurrence of so-called unacceptable situations, but sufficient change to and adaptation of the existing pattern of finance and expenditure to allow a normal system to continue in such a way that it prevents unacceptable situations arising. The object is not the indefinite distortion of

the system but its enhanced durability through appropriate change.

In the meantime, the business of the Community must go on. Existing policies in their existing form must be financed; the Community's existing commitments must be honoured and the general functioning of Community institutions must be assured. Within this framework and while remaining within the 1 % ceiling, the Commission has drawn up a budget which meets these existing obligations as cost-effectively as possible, which at the same time provides for the financing of the settlement in relation to the United Kingdom and includes an expansion of the structural portion of the budget.

Before turning to the expenditure side of the budget in more detail, I want to say a word about new own resources. In the light of what I have just said, I think the House will not be surprised to hear me say that the Commission does not believe it would be right, in advance of its financing study — which must include examination of the question of own resources — to put forward a proposal for extra own resources. Let us be thoroughly satisfied about the manner in which we are spending our existing finances before adding to them. In saying this, I am by no means belittling the importance of enabling the Community budget to expand in the longer term. Precisely because this is so important to the development of Europe we must proceed in an orderly fashion. Turning to the figures, the preliminary draft budget submitted by the Commission is of a total size of 21 734 m EUA in commitment appropriations, 20 053 m EUA in payment appropriations which represent increases of 25.5 % and 27.9 % respectively as compared with the 1980 budget which has just been adopted.

It would be right to underline that the 1980 budget, which is the basis for comparison, was a year in which, as a result of the particular political circumstances which arose, the level of budget expenditure enabled the Community to carry on its business but did not contribute to any significant development of existing or new Community policies. The basis of comparison for the structural funds in particular is therefore abnormally low and increases between 1980 and 1981 should be interpreted with this in mind.

The breakdown of this total amount into the main areas of Community expenditure is as follows. I turn first to agriculture. Titles 6 and 7 of the budget, EAGGF Guarantee, with a volume of 13 billion EUA, have increased by 12.7 % as compared with 1980, an increase of the same order as that between 1979 and 1980 — a development which shows a marked improvement on the rate of increase in agricultural guarantee expenditure of 23 % which the Community has experienced in recent years.

As in previous years, the budget makes financial provision for foreseeable market conditions and general

## Tugendhat

economic circumstances, as well as for the world market. I say 'foreseeable market conditions' since we are obliged to make the best estimates available to us. Let me assure the House, however, that we have done our best to make realistic estimates and have not based ourselves on deliberately over-optimistic assumptions about world market conditions in 1981.

Secondly, the preliminary draft budget does not, again as is normal, include provision for decisions which may be taken concerning agricultural prices and related measures for the farm year 1981/82. Early in 1981 the Commission will put forward to the budget authority proposals concerning prices, and preparations to this end will be made by the Commission before the end of 1980. When it makes its price proposals, the Commission will also make proposals for financing which, it stresses, will have to be found by savings within the existing agricultural financial envelope in order to ensure that neither the balance of the budget is upset nor the 1 % ceiling exceeded.

Agricultural expenditure continues to represent a preponderant proportion of the budget (64.5 % of the payments) which makes rigorous financial management imperative. The Commission is already undertaking this and will continue to do so in conjunction with a continuing examination of ways in which economies in agricultural expenditure can be made.

Let me now deal with structural and investment expenditure which constitute another important section of the budget. The great bulk of expenditure in the structural and investment fields is covered by the Social Fund, the Regional Fund, Guidance, EMS interest subsidies and now, of course, the supplementary measures for the United Kingdom.

The Social Fund is endowed with 1 000 m EUA in commitment appropriations, a 10 % increase as compared with 1980, and 710 m EUA in payment appropriations, a 90 % increase as compared with the new money for the Social Fund which was entered in the 1980 budget. The House will perhaps think this latter increase is very high. You should bear in mind what I have just said about the particular circumstances relating to the 1980 budget, which means that the percentage increase for payment appropriations is somewhat misleading. If one takes into account the total payment appropriations which are actually available for expenditure in 1980, which include a carry-forward of 233 m EUA from 1979, then the rate of increase in 1981 over 1980 expenditure levels drops to 16.8 %.

And of course it must be remembered that payment appropriations have to be entered and spent at a level sufficient for the Commission to honour commitments previously entered into. By the end of 1980 the total of commitments which will not by then have given rise to payments is expected to reach the level of 1 700 m EUA. Considerable progress has been made in 1979 in

the rate of utilization of payment appropriations. The Commission will do everything possible to guarantee a full utilization both in 1980 and 1981. The Regional Fund has the following proposed appropriations: 1 600 m EUA in commitment appropriations, a 37 % increase over 1980, and 770 m EUA in payment appropriations, a 91 % increase over 1980. Again the same caveat concerning 1980 as a basis for comparison applies to payment appropriations. It will be remarked that the rate of increase of commitment appropriations is higher than for the Social Fund. The main reason is that a net quota of 14.5 % has to be added for Greece. In the view of the Commission, this should not come as a deduction from the means which are at the moment made available to the other Member States.

Of the total amount of 770 m EUA in payment appropriations, 20 m EUA are earmarked for the non-quota section. If one then adds the EAGGF Guidance section which is 694 m EUA in commitment appropriations and 500 m EUA in payment appropriations, the three structural funds together come to a total of 3 295 m EUA in commitment appropriations, which represents a 25.6 % increase compared with 1980 and a 15 % share of the budget.

If one then takes in addition the EMS interest subsidies (200 m EUA as last year) and the supplementary measures for the UK, which will be spent on structural programmes, structural and investment expenditure reaches the level of 4 569 m EUA, i.e. 21 % of the budget in commitments. I might add, as regards the UK measures, that the Commission has made provision for financing the full net payment relating to 1980 with an advance at this stage in relation to 1981 of 100 m EUA.

I turn now to development aid and relations with third countries. The Commission has provided for the Community's continuing development of relations with third countries. In the development aid sector, aid to non-associated developing countries, with 200 m EUA in commitment appropriations and 65 m EUA in payment appropriations is a striking example, the increase in commitments over 1980 being over 40 %.

The new proposal for food aid takes account of the increase in quantities of cereals to be supplied within the framework of the new international wheat agreement. The Commission suggests that 927 000 tonnes of cereals be granted to developing countries instead of 720 000 tonnes, a 28.7 % increase over 1980. The quantities of butteroil also rise by 10 000 tonnes and the proposals for food aid in sugar show an increase of 3 000 tonnes.

Further specific aids have been proposed for Turkey (35 m EUA in commitments) and for Portugal (90 m EUA in commitments).

### Tugendhat

I am sad to report to the House, however, that the sectors of energy, industry and transport, which have not so far represented more than 2.5 % of the total budget, do not feature any more prominently in this preliminary draft. The main reason is that in present financial circumstances the Commission has been obliged to apply extremely rigorous criteria in the allocation of resources and has not felt able to endow with credits any proposals lacking a legal base, which thus prevents the Commission from implementing. Such is the case for the various aids to the coal sector, aid to the crisis-hit sectors of industry (Article 375), and financial support for transport infrastructure projects. All these lines are, I regret, shown only with a token entry. But I must emphasize that this is in no sense a reflection on the importance of such policies. On the contrary, and the Commission continues to urge upon the Council the importance of developing a coherent transport policy for the Community, of developing its energy policy which is of the utmost importance to the future of the Community economy and of allowing a coherent policy to aid the social aspects of the reorganization of the steel industry. These sectors all have a high priority for Community expenditure, and the Commission would hope to see funding take place in 1981 as soon as the Council takes the necessary action.

Finally, concerning expenditure and before moving on to the receipts side of the budget, I must say a word about staff. This year I feel obliged to say somewhat more than I usually do in the speech introducing the budget. For two years running now, the Commission's staff request has been salvaged by the other half of the budget authority and has fallen victim, if I may put it this way, to a wayside accident when it came to this half of the budget authority. I must tell the House that if the Commission is to continue to carry out the responsibilities with which it is charged under the Treaty by the other institutions, this cannot continue. This year, the Commission, in making a very modest staff request indeed, — 173 posts for Greek officials and no more than 150 for all other nationalities — has endeavoured to respond to the climate of restraint prevailing in the Member States concerning public expenditure, especially expenditure on the public service. But this request really cannot be cut any further. There is no fat here to be removed. A cut will be a cut into the muscle of the Commission's capacity to function. I am not therefore asking merely for sympathetic consideration of our staff request: I am asking for it to be agreed to in its entirety, and the Commission looks to the other institutions to treat their own staffing needs with the same degree of rigorous discrimination as they apply to the Commission's staff request.

I should add that following the Spierenburg Report, the Commission will also shortly be bringing forward proposals to increase the efficiency with which it is able to use its existing staff resources. With the staff request, these form a whole and it will be essential for them to be viewed as such and not given *à la carte*

treatment with some portions being unduly delayed. If this happens, many months of hard work to make the sort of improvements to the structure of the Commission which have frequently been urged upon us, will have been wasted. I therefore strongly urge the budget authority to give this matter its early, close and favourable attention.

Turning now to receipts, despite the rigour applied in the allocation of payments appropriations the VAT rate which results from a total amount to be financed of 20 053 m is 0.95 %.

Since in 1981 the Community's own resources will be of the order of 20 612 m EUA, the margin which remains to meet unexpected requirements is of the order of 550 m EUA. This is not a wide margin, but, if it is to be wider, something will have to be sacrificed. Furthermore, let me emphasize that this is a margin of unallocated resources for unforeseen contingencies for the whole budget; it cannot be assumed that any particular sector of Community expenditure has a prior claim over it.

Lastly, Mr President, I should like to say a few words on institutional points. First I should like to mention that in this preliminary draft the Commission has considered all the non-contractual part of food aid, i.e. that part which is not linked to any international agreement, as non-obligatory. The non-obligatory level of the budget increases by a quarter in commitments over 1980, from just over 4 billion EUA to rather over 5 billion EUA, that is to say 18.5 % of total proposed expenditure.

The Commission has maintained its proposal for the introduction of a Part II to the Commission sections of the budget in order to improve the presentation and the budgetary control over borrowing and lending operations and has also set aside, as previously, Chapters 90 and 91 for the future inclusion of EDF in the budget.

As I said at the outset of this speech, the 1981 budget is a budget for a Community in transition: we are on the threshold of changes in Community expenditure which will begin to occur during the course of 1981 itself. In the meantime and within present constraints, the Commission has endeavoured to use the Community's existing resources to the best advantage. If there are any here who feel that once again they are being asked to live on promises and that there is never any concrete progress, I should like to remind the House that, even in present circumstances, that is not entirely fair. When I became budget Commissioner four years ago, agricultural expenditure was taking 69 % of the total; in 1981, if the Commission's proposals are accepted, this proportion will drop to 59.5 %. Similarly, turning the ratio the other way round, the proportion of the budget devoted to the three big structural funds was 11.9 % by the end of 1977; in 1981 the Commission proposes that this should be 15.1 %. If one then



**Tugendhat**

adds the EMS subsidies and the UK measures, this proportion rises from 15.4 % to 21 %.

So gradual progress is being made, on which the Commission will continue to build in the course of 1981.

**President.** — A debate on the Commission statement is not provided for on the agenda, but only a brief statement by the Chairman of the Committee on Budgets.

I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange, Chairman of the Committee on Budgets.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to thank the rapporteur and the chairman of the Committee on Transport once again most sincerely for their cooperation in agreeing to this change in the agenda...

(Interruption)

... This will only take five minutes, so there will be quite enough time left to deal with the point which was originally first on the agenda. From an impartial point of view, what Mr Tugendhat had to say just now sounded perfectly alright. But the fact is that, having heard Mr Tugendhat's statement, and particularly after what we heard last night in the Committee on Budgets, this is not exactly what you might call a consolidating budget. Let me remind you that the President-in-Office of the Council — soon to become President of the Commission — made the worrying remark here in this House that certain sections of the Council seemed to be prepared to ignore every area of policy other than the agricultural policy if this was the only way of getting things done. I cannot believe that it would be in the interests of the Community to return to being merely agricultural. On the contrary, if we want to retain the respect we enjoy outside the Community, we must reinforce the Community by strengthening other areas of policy as well.

The Commission is right in saying that it has made a start in this respect, but what has given me, the Committee and the House as a whole cause for concern is the fact that — as Mr Tugendhat mentioned — the cutback in surplus production, particularly in the milk sector, will to all intents and purposes not really take effect until 1 January 1982. The idea is that the Commission should submit appropriate proposals by the middle of next year. Let me warn you once again that if this step is really not taken until 1982, we shall have major problems on our hands by the autumn of 1981. I would therefore issue an urgent appeal to the Commission — and this includes the Commission which will be taking office at the beginning of next year — to present proposals which can be dealt with speedily and could possibly come

into force by the middle of next year. Despite our aversion to supplementary or correcting budgets, I am sure the House would be prepared under these circumstances to accept such changes, which would guarantee a sensible future development of the Community, in a correcting or supplementary budget next year. Otherwise, the Community will inevitably descend into a state of practically insoluble crisis. In fact, it is my belief that the crisis already exists, and that the European Council has simply postponed the fateful day for 12 months.

I should like to assure Mr Tugendhat that — despite the fact that this arm of the budgetary authority may clash with the other arm on one question or another — there can be no alternative to the same rigorous standards being applied by all the Community institutions, whether in respect of material or staffing needs. We cannot apply different standards, and Parliament itself is not exempted from this rule. We cannot expect to deal with our own affairs differently from the way in which we deal with the Commission, the Council, the Court of Justice and the Court of Auditors. In this respect, then, we have no leeway, and we should not act as if we were something special compared with the other Community institutions. We are only one of those institutions, and we have clearly specified duties and a definite job to do. It will be up to Parliament to investigate very carefully the form of the 1981 budget to enable us to achieve our aim of allowing the Community to develop further. I am convinced that this is what really matters, and, in view of certain inescapable inadequacies in the Commission's draft — which, however, are largely in line with the Council's views — we are really in the situation of having to pursue the dialogue with the Council on the 1981 budget along the same lines as our recent battle with the Council on the 1980 budget. An additional major problem here, though, is the question of how the Community is to develop in the future. We want to see the Community's current work continued and the Community as such strengthened, not amputated and reduced in scope to a single area of policy.

Mr President, those were the general remarks I had to make on the Commission's preliminary draft budget. We shall have plenty of time in the months ahead to discuss the details, after which I hope we shall be able to present proposals which can then be put into practice.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Sutra on a point of order.

**Mr Sutra.** — (F) Mr President, a year ago — we had just been elected — we had the opportunity to enter into a dialogue immediately after Mr Tugendhat's statement. If I remember rightly, I had the honour of being the last to speak in that initial debate on the

## Sutra

budget. It is Parliament's desire for dialogue which causes it to ask questions and to raise points of detail, so that the Commissioner can prepare the budget for the big debate in September having first heard Parliament's views. I regret that the agenda does not make provision for the genuine dialogue between the institutions which we are constantly calling for. In my view it is absolutely indispensable to allow a few brief speeches of two or three minutes each, thereby making it possible to open up a real dialogue between Parliament and the Commission. I think that Mr Tugendhat will not be without work to do between now and September. I hope that he can take a holiday, but I think that September will be a little too late to deal with some of the questions which will be posed then.

7. *Air traffic control system*

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the debate on the report (Doc. 1-274/80), drawn up by Mr Janssen van Raay on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the development of a coordinated European air traffic control system.

I call Mr Janssen van Raay.

**Mr Janssen van Raay, rapporteur.** — (NL) Mr President, I felt obliged just now to agree to a reasonable request from Mr Lange. If I have thereby annoyed other Members, I am truly sorry. In my opinion, it was a reasonable request. It was something which was in Parliament's own interests.

Discussion of this report, which should have been on the agenda for Monday, before the meeting of the Transport Ministers, was put off for a few days. This firstly has the advantage that we can now comment on what the ministers decided and secondly has given everyone a little more time to consider this important subject.

A 'dangerous anachronism' is what Mr Berkhouwer, in his motion for a resolution which, as usual, was highly practical and to the point, calls air traffic control on a strictly national basis — and rightly so. My report comes out against this dangerous anachronism. The compartmentalization of European airspace in accordance with national borders gives rise to air traffic control on an unacceptable national basis, stems from a mistaken view of national sovereignty, and is irreconcilable with the efficient utilization of airspace.

The Eurocontrol Treaty concluded in 1960, whereby Eurocontrol would be made responsible for operational air traffic control in the upper airspace — that is, the airspace above 20 000 feet or 6 000 metres — with the signatory states being free to decide whether or not to transfer air traffic control functions for the

lower airspace, was therefore a very welcome and promising development.

Surely, if ever a subject was tailor-made for a European approach, it is the integration of European air traffic control. That being so, it is galling to find that now, twenty years on, precious little has come of the high hopes that were held in the 1960s. The directly-elected European Parliament, as the authentic voice of the voters who use the airspace over Europe, now has a splendid chance to give fresh impetus to the developments initiated in 1960.

Mr President, I shall restrict my remarks to a few major points from the report. Air transport safety and fuel economy are two of the essential aims of this report at European level. As Captain Gaebel of Lufthansa said at the hearing, Europe has a relatively good safety record. I would emphasize the word 'relatively' because when I asked Captain Gaebel what he meant by that, he explained that Europe had a better safety record than other parts of the world. It goes without saying that this is no reason to neglect further measures to increase the safety enjoyed by air travellers.

My report refers to the example of a short-haul flight from Copenhagen to Paris, in the course of which the pilot has to change not once, but five times, between the frequencies operated by air traffic controllers who do not use compatible computers: firstly from Scandinavia to Eurocontrol in Beek, then from Beek to Schiphol, then from Schiphol back to Beek and finally from Beek to France. It goes without saying that on such a short flight, this puts an excessive burden on air traffic controllers and pilots alike, and in critical situations such as bad weather and near-misses, with the attendant increase in risk for air travellers, this is unacceptable, because every single crash and even every near-miss is one too many. The situation will be exacerbated if there is a reduction in the horizontal and vertical separation distances, as is proposed because of increasing congestion at airports and in the airspace above airports.

As to the question of saving fuel, the economical use of energy enjoys high political priority, and rightly so. The fact is that the absence of an integrated air traffic control system is responsible for a great deal of needless waste of precious kerosene. Roundabout routes, uneconomical cruising heights and circling in holding patterns are the cause of this waste. I shall not go into the question of delays and cancellations with all the annoyance and time-wasting they cause to the travelling public. The aim of air traffic control is to ensure safe, regular, punctual and economical air transport, which is very far from what we have at the present. If this resolution is adopted — and, what is more important, implemented — this situation is bound to improve.

## Janssen van Raay

What, then, is the motion for a resolution aiming to achieve in concrete terms? Firstly, the Eurocontrol centres in Beek and Karlsruhe should continue to exercise their current operational functions in the airspace of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Federal Republic of Germany. If this situation is interfered with, all the fine plans of 1960 will founder completely.

Let me make it quite clear here in this House that we will not be fobbed off with some empty gesture.

We must make it clear to the Transport Ministers, who have put off their decision, that air traffic flow management — in other words, the arrangement of air traffic in such a way as to prevent congestion and delay as an alternative to air traffic control, comes into the category of empty gestures. Air traffic flow management is not something which needs to be done in an expensive centre in Beek; it can just as easily be done, if you like in a house on the Prinsengracht in Amsterdam. I am not, of course, trying to detract from the importance of air traffic flow management as such, and I welcome the Transport Ministers' decision last Tuesday to investigate the possibility of transferring these duties to Eurocontrol. After all, they are important duties.

Secondly, the motion for a resolution calls on the Dutch Government to fulfill at last its obligations under the Convention and to transfer responsibility for air traffic control in the upper airspace from Schiphol to Beek. The Netherlands fought hard — and ultimately with success — to get the first Eurocontrol centre established on its territory. With a view to the employment situation in Limburg this centre, which was financed largely by the other signatories to the Convention, was built in Beek, where it has the very latest in modern technology. It is therefore crazy that the Netherlands — of all countries — should now, eight years later, still be making no use of this centre on its own territory. There is no good reason for this violation of the Convention. There has simply not been the political will to break down the resistance created by official foot-dragging and the narrow-minded protection of vested interests. If the Germans now turn the clock back and take over, or renationalize, Eurocontrol's operational functions, the Netherlands will be responsible.

As a Dutchman and a member of the major government party I sincerely regret having to say these hard words, but I am speaking here as a Member of the European Parliament, and I am pleased that Mr Berkhout, whose party is also in the government, did not hesitate to table this motion for a resolution. Our views tally precisely here, as we regard ourselves first and foremost as Members of the European Parliament.

The third objective of the motion for a resolution concerns Italy, and on this point I am pleased to be

able to take a more positive line. Italy is not a member of Eurocontrol, nor is Denmark, and the motion for a resolution appeals to these two Member States to accede to the Convention. It would appear that Italy has not done so so far because air traffic control in that country is in the hands of the military. This situation will, however, change in the near future, which is the good news I have to impart. When I visited Ciampino, the air traffic control centre near Rome, I not only found a willingness to join the Eurocontrol system but was also able to see the extremely up-to-date equipment — made in Italy — which meets the most stringent requirements and which will make it technically possible for Italy to be integrated directly into the Eurocontrol system. I therefore very much hope that the Italian Members will support this motion for a resolution and will thus put pressure on Italy, which is an important country for air traffic, to become a member of Eurocontrol.

I should also like to appeal to the Danes to show similar solidarity — after all, Denmark too, with the Blue 29 corridor, is an important country for air traffic.

France, the United Kingdom and Ireland are signatories to the Convention, but pulled out of Eurocontrol's operational functions at an early stage. This is regrettable, particularly as regards Ireland, where Eurocontrol money was used to construct a modern control centre, which is, however, only used at national level. I would appeal to all Members to view this problem not just in terms of national sovereignty, but also from the point of view of national airlines — in particular, Air France and British Airways. It goes without saying that they would benefit enormously from an integrated system of control in the upper air space. I would therefore invite the British and French Members to view the motion in this light and not simply from the point of view of national sovereignty, which is in any case misunderstood, as sovereignty does not seal off a particular country's airspace from other countries' radar systems. That is the real point. It is worth noting that British Airways, for instance, would not itself benefit from the facilities offered by a British Eurocontrol centre but would, on the way from London to New Delhi, benefit enormously from similar centres in France, Italy and Greece.

I would therefore call on all those concerned to implement Article 1 of the Convention, which says: 'The contracting parties agree to strengthen their cooperation in matters of air navigation and in particular to provide for the common organization of the air traffic services in the upper airspace.' All I want is for these countries to fulfil their obligations under the Convention.

*(Applause)*

## IN THE CHAIR: MR MØLLER

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Albers to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Albers.** — (NL) Mr President, the convention on which the European Organization for the Safety of Air Navigation is based dates back to 1963. Debating the future of Eurocontrol here in this House, we are inevitably reminded of another convention — the Mannheim Convention of 1868 — which was and is of great importance for another sector of transport, namely navigation on the Rhine. Unlike the Eurocontrol Convention, the Mannheim Convention is still viable and new protocols are still being added to it, whereas the Eurocontrol Convention has been under constant pressure in the close on 20 years of its existence, and has indeed given rise to all manner of problems.

Moreover, as Mr Janssen van Raay's excellent and exhaustive report makes clear, a number of countries have failed to fulfil their obligations under the Convention. In fact, only two Member States — Belgium and Luxembourg — have faithfully carried out the terms of the Convention. In the circumstances, it is no wonder that there is precious little enthusiasm for renewing and improving the Convention in 1983.

Nonetheless, the Convention can claim some important technical successes, such as the experimental centre in Brétigny-sur-Orge in France, the air traffic control training institute in Luxembourg, the Upper Airspace Control Centre in Maastricht, a similar centre in Karlsruhe and another one in Shannon in Ireland, as well as facilities with secondary radar scanners at four locations in Europe, not to mention the central office for collecting route charges in Brussels. All this has required a high level of capital investment, a large store of knowledge has been gathered over the last twenty years, and there are now more than 1 200 officials employed, including highly qualified experts in technical, operational, experimental, training and administrative fields. But, as I said Eurocontrol is under constant pressure, which has in turn given rise to a great deal of unrest among the officials and to industrial action on the part of European public service unions. The European Parliament has also been active on the question of Eurocontrol. The report lists a large number of moves by Members of this House on the question of air traffic control and safety, particularly following the disastrous collision near Zagreb and the serious disruption to holiday flights as a result of industrial action by air traffic controllers in various countries in Western Europe.

What strikes one here is the pioneering role played by the European Parliament. Most of the national Parlia-

ments have devoted very little attention to Eurocontrol. Only in the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany, and more recently in Belgium as well, have questions been asked and discussions held with government representatives. It is notable that last November the Second Chamber in the Netherlands adopted two motions calling for the retention of the Eurocontrol Centre in Maastricht, the transfer of national air control duties to this centre and the creation of a supranational air traffic control authority. Public opinion too began to take more of an interest in the subject, and it was widely felt that air transport, and particularly air traffic safety, was the very area in which Western European integration was needed. Probably under the pressure which was thus exerted on the governments concerned, last year saw a change of mood in favour of Eurocontrol. There were reports that the continued existence of Eurocontrol was to be guaranteed. However, my Group feels that we have every reason to remain vigilant on all fronts which is why the Socialist spokesmen from the various national parliaments were invited to Brussels on 12 May to discuss how vigilance of members of Parliament could best be mobilized to prevent a tacit extension of the current Convention in 1983 from leading to the slow but sure death of Eurocontrol, bearing in mind also that enormous amounts of money have meanwhile been invested in other national centres. This meeting in Brussels was a milestone for those who took part, because similar discussion and cooperation between Members of the European Parliament and Members of the national Parliaments could perhaps further stimulate the cause of European coordination and integration in other fields as well. It was generally agreed that Europe had to have a joint system of air traffic control and that Eurocontrol should be maintained and further developed. In the medium term, the Socialist Group aims to bring Eurocontrol within the Community's sphere of influence — with Parliamentary control being exercised by the European Parliament — especially as the people of Western Europe would not understand if such a useful institution as Eurocontrol were to be shut down on account of national motives and interests. On 22 June 1979, the Netherlands Pilots Association sent a letter to the Netherlands Secretary of State urging the transfer of air traffic control to Eurocontrol. The latter pointed out that the continued existence of the Amsterdam control centre at Schiphol meant firstly, that the available means of improving the safety of air transport were not being put to optimum use, secondly that the Netherlands Government, and in particular the Rijksluchtvaartdienst, was interfering with the regularity of air traffic with all the attendant inconvenience, especially to air travellers and that an unnecessary amount of money is being spent on developing a variety of incompatible electronic traffic control systems. At a meeting on 27 March this year, the Netherlands Secretary of State said, however, that the government very much hoped that the Maastricht Centre could be maintained both quantitatively and qualitatively. A mere expression of hope is small consolation, given

## Albers

the political pressure in the national parliaments, the intensity of public feeling and the opinions expressed by numerous experts. For these reasons, the Socialist Group gives its full support to the motion for a resolution in Mr Janssen van Raay's report. In conclusion, let me offer my sincere congratulations to Mr Janssen van Raay for this first report he has drawn up on behalf of the European Parliament's Committee on Transport.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Notenboom to speak on behalf of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

**Mr Notenboom.** — (NL) Mr President, I have given up a few minutes of my speaking time to the rapporteur to enable him to give us a full introduction to this debate.

On behalf of my whole group, I should like to thank the rapporteur most sincerely for his outstanding report and his explanatory statement. We are also grateful for the unanimity shown by the Committee on Transport, and our special thanks are due to the Chairman of the Committee, Mr Seefeld, who represents, as it were, a bridge between the old pre-election Parliament and the directly elected European Parliament. He has always done his utmost to bring about the creation of a single system of air traffic control in Europe.

As Mr Albers said, and as we can see in the report, there have in the past been various moves in this direction, but never with this kind of intensive and single-minded determination. The new Parliament is thereby faithfully continuing the work of its predecessor, although we are straying somewhat from the field mapped out for us under our formal powers. However, the European Parliament is *par excellence* the elected institution in Europe capable of expressing the political will of the people of Europe. That is something the rapporteur has himself contributed to and I hope that his report will serve to back those national parliaments which have come out in favour of the retention of Eurocontrol and will encourage those which have not yet done so to add their support. I hope that this expression of the will of the European Parliament will have some effect on opinion in the various national parliaments.

It is incredible that, despite the advanced stage of preparations and the enormous amounts of capital and — particularly — human investment, this European project from the 1960s is now once again being called into question. The sense of it is beyond me. The project has the support of national parliaments, and every one who has gone into the matter in any depth recently has very soon come to the logical conclusion that this is really the only solution.

But there are always other elements bent on destruction, despite the fact that Euro-Pilot, the European pilots' organization, also says that this is the best solution. These are the people to whom we entrust our lives whenever we get into an aeroplane. Should we not respect their judgement? That is what we do whenever we get into an aeroplane. Why, then, should we not do the same when the point at issue is the organization of a system for the safety of air transport. This logical connection was brought out earlier by the rapporteur. We therefore give our full support to the motion for a resolution tabled by the rapporteur which has unanimous approval of the Committee on Transport. It is a sad fact that unanimity has not been all that common recently in this House, but fortunately it was achieved in this case.

One more reason why we are particularly glad to vote for this motion for a resolution is that the threatened Eurocontrol Centre in Maastricht-Beek is situated in a part of Europe where the staple industry and main employer, mining, has been in decline since 1964. The decision to close down the mines was taken in the context of the European Coal and Steel Community and was thought at the time to be necessary, although some doubt has since been cast on the wisdom of this. At any rate, that is the area in which the Maastricht-Beek Centre is now situated, offering some compensation for the loss of jobs in the region, which is still far from having recovered from the decline of the mining industry over the last fifteen years.

I would ask you to bear this point in mind as well when you come to cast your vote. Let me finally express my thanks once more to the rapporteur and to the Committee on Transport. I hope that this report will act as a stimulus to the national parliaments and governments to follow the right path.

**President.** — I call Mr Cottrell to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Cottrell.** — It seems to me that it is a particularly sad comment on the prospects for European unity that we actually have to hold this debate at all. It seems to me, and I think to most sensible people, that the Community exists above all to promote harmony in certain vital areas. And it is difficult to see what could be more vital than the matter of safety in the air.

The decision to launch Eurocontrol in 1960 was, in my view, a brave and practical initiative and there should have been every reasonable certainty that by now, 20 years later, the Community would have an air-safety organization which would indeed be the envy of the world. But the fact is we do not.

Eurocontrol has become a starveling, wilfully neglected by its original god-parents — the contracting parties to the original Eurocontrol Treaty. The

**Cottrell**

entire organization, as we have heard, now threatens to founder on the reef of national rivalry, national egoism. How ridiculous it will seem to the voters of Europe — the people who sent us here — that, in this House, in our committees, in the Commission and in the Council, so many hours, and even days, are spent discussing frankly trivial matters of harmonization — such as lawn-mowers — when we have done nothing positive to remove invisible barriers in the sky.

Now I am well aware that the British Government is among the trio of god-parents—I think we can reasonably say it is a trio — who have failed to watch carefully over this particular infant. And I regret that Community airspace to all intents and purposes remains divided by an artificial jigsaw.

I am aware of certain objections—and they do come partially from my own country—to cooperation between military and civilian sectors. But surely such objections cannot be realistic within a Community which is part of an overall Western alliance, even if all Member States within the Community are not actually members of NATO.

It is not just a question of safety, it is a question of delay—unreasonable delay—to people who use the European air routes and it is a question of waste of fuel and time by airliners being forced to fly circuitous routes because we maintain these artificial barriers.

My group welcomes this report and we welcome the motion for a resolution contained in it.

We are gathered here, if nothing else, as Europeans. And there is no doubt in my mind that on this issue we must speak and vote as Europeans. We may still be burdened with absurd hindrances at our national land frontiers, but we should do nothing to continue their observance in the open skies above the Community. On the contrary, we should use the will—the political will—of this Parliament to do everything to remove them.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Carossino to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

**Mr Carossino.** — *(I)* Mr President, the tragic air disaster over the Tyrrhenian Sea, with a loss of 81 lives, has over the last few days raised once again in Italy the issue of air transport safety and civil aviation traffic control, in other words the overall practicability and safety of air routes.

Naturally the problem primarily concerns the authorities of the individual countries, but it also raises issues at Community level, since the subject of transport, including maritime and air transport, was and ought to

constitute the second common policy in order of priority after the agricultural policy according to the Treaty establishing the Communities. The failure of the Community authorities and the governments of the Member States up till now to fulfil the obligation to establish an integrated system and a common policy for transport is a serious responsibility on their part.

This longstanding lack of achievement has shared in greatly distorting the form and structure of the Common Market as a uniformly-organized economic area and has jeopardized future unification by exacerbating the crisis currently besetting its institutions.

The fact that, instead of gradually being extended to all the Community's air space, the Eurocontrol organization is threatened with liquidation in the near future, is primarily due to this long-standing failure to implement the Treaty and reflects a lack of united political resolve, even in spheres such as the organization of air traffic control and transport, which call for the circumscription and overcoming of corporative and nationalistic ideas.

The motion of the Committee on Transport draws attention to the urgent case of Eurocontrol and calls for its dissolution to be avoided or for it to be given a specific, albeit limited, function. We therefore hope that this resolution will be approved. Nevertheless, we must point out the limits of today's debate. Parliament should be entrusted as soon as possible not only with the problem of air transport, but also with the considerably more complicated, many-sided and wider problem of a common transport policy in fulfilment of the Treaty; we must create the conditions for such a debate and call the attention not only of governments and public opinion but of all Community institutions to the political and institutional implications of this lack of action. This is not only a clear task for this Parliament but a debt we owe to the memory of the innocent victims of the air disaster in the Tyrrhenian Sea.

**President.** — I call Mr Berkhouwer to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Berkhouwer.** — *(NL)* Mr President, as the Bard might have said: 'Eurocontrol or bureaucontrol, that is the question'. This whole issue is a classic instance of the enormous gap between technical progress in this last quarter of the 20th century and our ability — or rather, inability — to cooperate politically.

The United States' airspace is four times the size of the total airspace over Europe, and something like two thirds of all the world's air traffic is in the United States, where air traffic control is the responsibility of an agency running 26 control centres with standardized equipment. The sad reality in Europe is that here in the Old World, we have 21 air traffic control

**Berkhouwer**

services using — to a great extent — different types of equipment, with all the attendant hazards for the travelling public we represent. That was the point I made in September last year, and I am glad that my attempt to get this House to take action in this field has met with such a gratifying response. Mr Janssen van Raay has already referred to the route between Copenhagen and Paris, which is only one of many examples one could give and once again illustrates the fragmentation which is crippling air traffic control in Western Europe, with the fragmentation of Eurocontrol being encouraged rather than discouraged by narrow-minded nationalistic thinking and lack of political will on the part of various Member States. One of the positive results of our initiative on Monday evening — I mean our telegram — to get the Transport Ministers to postpone their decision and await the opinion of this House is that no decision will now be forthcoming before the end of year, so that we shall meanwhile have the time we need to get things moving on this question.

This fragmentation I referred to earlier — not to mention the lack of democratic parliamentary control at its rightful level — means that each country has its own type of modern equipment which it is trying to develop further, while the results obtained so far have been woefully inadequate despite spiraling costs. I need not dwell on the enormous waste of energy as a result of all extra kilometres that have to be flown.

In some cases hundreds of miles which could be saved if only air traffic control was integrated and aircraft could fly as the crow flies. As it is, flying in Europe is getting more expensive every day. Unfortunately, only seven of the Member States of the Community are signatories to the Eurocontrol Convention. Italy, though, is on the right path, and let us hope that Denmark will follow suit.

Formally, constitutionally and institutionally, Eurocontrol does not as yet come under the Community's executive. I think that here we must draw a distinction between the executive and the European Parliament, for the following reasons. The fact that the executive is not so far responsible for Eurocontrol does not of course prevent us, as representatives of the people of Europe, from discussing the question. Indeed, I regard it as an elementary duty on the part of the European Parliament to set ourselves up as a veritable *vox populi europeae* when the people of Europe are the victims of all manner of inconvenience due to mishaps which are the result of the lack of political will to allow Eurocontrol to function as laid down in the 1963 Convention, of which the liberal Netherlands Secretary of State for Transport of the day was one of the architects. In this respect, I go along with Mr Janssen van Raay in deploring the fact that my country — which is otherwise so European-minded — has welshed on its commitments. I see this as the enormous advantage we have, that we are here as representatives of the people of Europe who no longer have to labour under the

burden of a dual mandate — at least, that goes for most of us — because otherwise we might occasionally have had to take a different line.

I therefore continue to hope that the ancient European city of Amsterdam may at some time in the future rediscover its European identity and transfer its powers to Limburg, our beloved Limburg, the land of unlimited opportunities which has had to give up its coal industry. If we had only known then what we know now, we may have resisted the pit closures, because now everyone is calling out for coal again. But that is just by the by. At any rate, we should try to leave Limburg the modest compensation it received in the form of the Eurocontrol Centre.

There is not much left for me to say; most of the points have already been made by other speakers, and of course I should like wholeheartedly to endorse their remarks. It is now up to us to decide whether to continue the run-down of Eurocontrol or to give it a new lease of life. However, this Parliament has no real choice other than to follow the line taken by its predecessor. We should therefore regard today's debate as a first step along a new path involving all manner of constructive initiatives on our part. We must keep the ball rolling. I have the greatest respect for what the Chairman of our committee, Mr Seefeld, has done recently. He is an essential member of the action group we must form, and he was quick to take up my idea last autumn and build on it in the Committee on Transport. Of course, I have nothing but praise for the admirable work done by Mr Janssen van Raay. However, this is only a first step, a first attempt to save Eurocontrol. We must continue our efforts in this direction. Public hearings, for example, may be a useful institution. We must continue to take the initiative with regard to Eurocontrol. We must bear in mind the decision that the Transport Ministers will have to take by the end of the year. We must keep the situation under constant review and once again demand explanations from people. Let us organize a hearing and have the people from Amsterdam come and explain how things stand. These are just a few ideas of mine, and I am very grateful for having the chance to put them forward. My Group too will be voting unanimously for Mr Janssen van Raay's motion for a resolution.

**President.** — I call Miss Roberts.

**Miss Roberts.** — Mr President, the advantages of an integrated air traffic control system are so clearly brought out in Mr Janssen van Raay's excellent report that it is very difficult to understand the lack of political will on the part of some of the member governments. I want to enlarge on just one of the advantages of an integrated system and that is the reduction which would occur in the amount of stacking that takes place at the present time. This has been referred to earlier in

**Roberts**

the debate and the economic advantages and the saving in fuel if one could reduce the amount of stacking are self-evident, but, drawing upon my own personal experience with my constituency, I want to mention the environmental benefits to the people who live and work within the vicinity of an airport.

My constituency in London is very close indeed to London Heathrow, which is the busiest airport in the world. Now, I think people who either live or work near an airport must expect to endure the inconvenience of planes landing and taking off. What I do not think it is reasonable to expect them to endure is an inordinate amount of stacking, because the air traffic control system is less than fully efficient. This seems to me to be a nuisance which could and should be eliminated and, whilst I support the whole of Mr Janssen van Raay's report, which I was very happy to see was carried unanimously in the Committee on Transport, I want to draw particular attention to this aspect. I do think that for people to have to suffer the nuisance, the constant irritation of planes stacking before they are able to land, is a burden which should not be put upon them. I would call upon the member governments to do all they can to improve the air traffic control system in Europe, to try to get it up to the level which exists in the United States and this would, amongst the very many benefits, give considerable environmental relief for those who live and work in the vicinity of airports.

**President.** — I call Mr Martin.

**Mr. Martin.** — (F) Mr President, the French members of the Communist and Allies Group will be voting against the report by Mr Janssen van Raay on the development of a coordinated European air traffic control system and against Mr Berkhouwer's resolution.

We consider it particularly unacceptable to state, firstly, that the present air traffic control system organized on essentially national lines results in an excessive workload for air traffic control staff and services. First and foremost it is the inadequate technical and material facilities in service, i.e. the austerity measures, which are responsible for present problems. In France, these have sparked off strikes and serious conflict which are in themselves real contributions to improved air safety.

Secondly, it is not acceptable either to state that the establishment of a supranational system is the only way of solving the problems of cooperation in air traffic control.

Technically speaking, it is no more complicated to maintain a plurinational system respecting States' thoroughfare rights. The specialists will tell you so.

As far as the French Communists and Allies are concerned, they are not willing to accept any encroachment on national sovereignty and national responsibility for air traffic control. Moreover, you know for a fact that the Treaty of Rome gives the European Parliament no jurisdiction over this matter! It makes you wonder whether the intention is not to impose in due course a supranational European organization of military air traffic under the aegis of NATO.

Finally, we would like to point out that the documents submitted mainly confine their comments and considerations to the nine countries of the Community. Only token reference is made to countries like Austria, Switzerland, Finland, Sweden, Hungary, Czechoslovakia or the Soviet Union, or they are completely forgotten. But these countries also have airspace and are also part of Europe!

If cooperation, organization and safety in air transport are supposed to be the real aim of the documents submitted to us, why then do they not mention the deliberations and studies in which the International Civil Aviation Organization or the *Groupeement Européen de planification de la navigation aérienne* (European Air Traffic Planning Group) are currently engaged. These studies aim to improve control of air traffic flow on a bilateral or multilateral basis extending far beyond the Nine.

In fact, what is really behind these documents is the political will to go further along the road to the economic integration of the Nine and the establishment of supranational control.

I strongly suspect that air traffic safety and control issues basically hardly interest you. I rather fear that by proceeding in this way you are endeavouring to undermine national public services and, by so doing, to put in question present staff regulations.

In this way, you are seeking to turn Eurocontrol into a supranational institution restricted to a few countries.

Eurocontrol must become a plurinational control agency designed to work out a coherent overall plan for European air traffic, mainly at the planning and research level.

Eurocontrol can become an instrument for cooperation while respecting each nation's sovereignty and extending far beyond Community frontiers. But your supranational vision is about as restricted as the windowless dome of this chamber, where no sky or sunlight are ever to be seen!



**President.** — I call Mr Moorhouse.

**Mr Moorhouse.** — Mr President, first of all may I say how much in the European Democratic Group we appreciate the initiative taken by Mr Berkhouwer. He has expressed his enthusiasm for this subject and his concern that action should be taken. I hope very much indeed that the powers-that-be will take note of his words, as indeed I trust the powers-that-be will take note of Mr van Raay's excellent report, to which we give our full support.

Now, listening to Mr Martin, one might assume that all is well, that air travellers are content with the present situation, but of course this manifestly is not so. I would like, if I may, to quote a few figures for the delays which have occurred to flights out of the United Kingdom and Ireland in the past year or so, because the statistics are really rather startling. From London Heathrow for instance — and Miss Roberts touched on this subject — there have been the most formidable delays ranging from an average of 60 minutes back in July 1979 to average delays of 210 minutes, depending on the time of day. Now, delays of this sort are totally unacceptable and quite insufferable and in themselves call for positive constructive action and show, I think, that the present situation just will not do. Equally, travellers from Ireland have been suffering. Back in July 1979 we learned that 100 % of Aer Lingus flights were delayed and the average delay was no less than 199 minutes — 199 minutes!

Now, one must therefore question the present system, as the report rightly does. One must say that there is a lack of proper coordination between national civil air traffic control authorities, on the one hand, and between the civil and the military, on the other. Furthermore, as has been pointed out both by Mr van Raay and by Mr Berkhouwer and others, owing to the present unsatisfactory set-up within Europe, airlines are obliged to fly roundabout routes and on average 15 % further than if they had taken the shortest routes. Indeed, on one particular route quoted by the rapporteur, the distance flown is no less than 47 % longer than the most direct route. This is an expensive exercise, surely, in both time and money. And then there were the startling facts which the rapporteur made about the short flight from Copenhagen to Paris and how it is controlled by five — repeat five — separate control centres. So that if you take off from Copenhagen — and I am sure you, Mr President, must do this on occasion — you fly first over Denmark, where you are handled by the Scandinavian centre, after which the aircraft is passed on to the Eurocontrol Centre in Maastricht when over North Germany, to the Schiphol Centre when over the Netherlands, back to the Eurocontrol Centre in Maastricht when over Belgium and lastly to the French controllers when over France. One cannot feel altogether easy in

one's mind, I feel, about the air safety aspects and certainly it is not exactly an efficient method of going about things. This is why I think we are inevitably drawn — all of us must be except, apparently, Mr Martin — to a European-type solution. We must think in European terms on a European scale and it is all the more important to do so at this time, when we may be moving into a more liberalized pattern of air transport within Europe, because if the present situation is not satisfactory, how can we possibly cope with the increased numbers of flights that there will surely be in the immediate years ahead.

Mr President, I firmly believe that we are facing a situation of no less than crisis proportions. We just cannot afford to let the situation drift. Further action is imperative and it is good to know today that the Permanent Commission of Ministers of Eurocontrol have met in Brussels and do now appear to be acknowledging that air-traffic management within Europe must be on a European scale and that the Ministers concerned, not all from within the Community, as we know, are aware of this acute problem and are now prepared to put their minds towards a more forward-looking approach.

**President.** — I call Mr Combe.

**Mr Combe.** — (F) Mr President, I thank Mr Janssen van Raay for the excellent work he has done and the lucid manner in which he has presented the situation in the European air traffic system.

I also support the excellent initiative taken by Mr Berkhouwer in the motion for a resolution he has tabled.

It is essential to draw attention to the underutilized capacity of the air traffic control system and the frequent incompatibility of air traffic control apparatus and equipment, which generates increased costs and wastage, whereas a solution could be found to all these problems by entrusting the coordination of air traffic to a single agency, such as Eurocontrol, covering the whole of Europe.

Since I live near the Brétigny Eurocontrol centre in France, I can testify to the competence of the staff there. I consider it vital for a single air traffic control system to be established and not only for the Eurocontrol centres in Maastricht and Karlsruhe to be maintained but also for other centres to be set up and managed by this Agency and for all Member States to participate fully and unreservedly in operating them.

**Combe**

A few comments of a technical nature will, no doubt, suffice to illustrate the vital need for Eurocontrol, since those who took the floor before me have already discussed this at length.

Eurocontrol centres use the radar systems of various countries and thus have the benefit of more complete and reliable radar coverage of the airspace. This is a major advantage they have over centres in individual countries which only use national radar systems.

The Eurocontrol centre in Maastricht cost 150 million guilders. The national control centre in Amsterdam, with a capacity and level of sophistication only half that of Maastricht cost a great deal more.

The Maastricht centre could serve as a model for the setting up of similar centres elsewhere. In that case, up to 50 million guilders could be saved on the installation costs of new centres, since advantage would be taken of the system already developed for the first centre.

The coordination of civilian and military air traffic control systems is a major source of difficulties for national control services. There is a correlation between these difficulties and the number of cases where the minimum authorized distance between two planes is not observed. As a result of the proper coordination of civilian and military air traffic control at the Maastricht centre, the number of such cases in the North of Germany dropped from an annual figure of 300 to 10 when the air-space over this area came under the control of the centre.

A recent study showed that, for 1978, the average cost of national air traffic control services was 44 dollars per 100 flight kilometres while that of the Eurocontrol centres was only 32 dollars.

Owing to the heterogeneous situation in European airspace and the lack of air traffic coordination between the various States, there are — as has been mentioned — numerous flight delays.

According to IATA, the cost of such delays for Western Europe alone is in the region of 200 to 400 million dollars per year.

This is why the airlines have always insisted on the need for a single air traffic control centre, similar to what they already have in the United States — this has also been mentioned. It has not, however, been possible to set up such a centre, since the Member States prefer to maintain their national control services, whose effectiveness in present-day conditions is questioned by the airlines.

At present, the airlines bear 90 % of the cost of air traffic control services in Europe. Next year, they

will pay 100 %. These charges are obviously passed on to the passengers. Economic air traffic control services, in other words, a system entrusted to a single European agency, are thus of vital importance for the airlines and their users.

The Eurocontrol centres in Maastricht and Karlsruhe have also — it must be pointed out — obtained the greater proportion of their equipment from European industry, while in many cases the national centres either, as in the United Kingdom, use non-European equipment or as in the case of Spain, are likely to do so in the near future.

Mr President, I think these few remarks suffice to show the obvious usefulness of the Eurocontrol centres and the need to develop them further. I am happy the Transport Committee was unanimous in approving the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Berkhouwer and the report by Mr Janssen van Raay.

I am sure that the Members of Parliament will also unanimously support their committee.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Seefeld.

**Mr Seefeld, Chairman of the Committee on Transport.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I beg your indulgence for the few remarks I have to make at the end of this debate in my capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Transport.

As you all know, this debate was originally scheduled for Monday, but on the appointed day it looked as though it would be impossible to conduct it in the spirit of unemotional objectivity it deserved. We deliberately scheduled the debate for Monday because Parliament wanted to make its opinion known to the Ministers from the Eurocontrol member states before they met on the following Tuesday. We wanted to tell the Ministers that we were in favour of the retention of Eurocontrol, and — like everyone else — I had no doubt that most of the Members of this House — indeed, perhaps almost all of them — would support the Committee on Transport and its rapporteur, Mr Janssen van Raay. All the political groups wanted the debate to take place on the Monday, and the Bureau agreed. The preparatory work on this report was done with great care, hearings were held with experts in the field, and the committee was unanimous in its findings.

Ladies and gentlemen, when good sense is required, it can usually win the day — or at least, one hopes it can. Unfortunately, that is not always the case in this

## Seefeld

House, because we have a certain colleague by the name of Mr Pannella. It proved impossible to take the vote on Monday because that honourable Member, who has in the past proved to be enough of a thorn in the side of this Parliament, wanted to bask in the limelight again. He is supposed to have tabled 22 amendments, but none of them have so far appeared before us. Nor do I see him here now, although he wanted to take part in the debate. All this he has failed to do, but on Monday he managed to prevent the House from taking a clear decision for the following Tuesday. Ladies and gentlemen, the behaviour of the honourable Member seems to me — not only today and on Monday, but all together, and I am choosing my words very carefully here — to be extremely eccentric, to put it mildly. After all, he said on Monday that he would withdraw his amendments if the debate were to take place on the Tuesday. What kind of parliamentary behaviour is that? Surely, if one tables an amendment, it has to do with the matter in hand, in which case it is perfectly valid. But to table amendments just to create a commotion is, I think, the kind of behaviour which doctors would regard as symptomatic of a very serious mental condition. Here again, I am being very careful about my choice of words.

Moving on to the matter in hand, I should like to thank all those who have so far spoken in this debate. My thanks are due especially to Mr Janssen van Raay for his outstanding report, and I should also like to thank the President of our Parliament, who helped us out of a difficult situation by communicating our opinion in advance to the Council of Ministers, which was already in session. Mr President, I would ask you to place this on the record in the Bureau. The President was really very helpful in this respect, and her efforts will be shown to have been fruitful, because I hear that the President-in-Office of the Council of Ministers responsible for Eurocontrol will be replying to her.

Mr Berkhouwer has taken up a long-standing idea of mine, and I should like to add a few words to what he had to say. We should give serious consideration to whether Eurocontrol should at some time become an integral part of a European air transport policy, partly because this will give us in the European Parliament the right to a say in what goes on and the chance to exercise supervision. I think this is an important matter which should be discussed further in the Committee on Transport.

Mr President, there is no need for me to repeat everything that has already been said by the previous speakers. I agreed with all of them with the exception of Mr Martin, but I am not too worried about this difference of opinion as I know that his own party colleagues in the Committee on Transport shared our opinion.

Ladies and gentlemen, we freely-elected Members of the European Parliament are working to build a united Europe, but it seems to me that, in one area at least,

our national governments are busy dismantling an element of the close cooperation within Eurocontrol that we regard as useful and essential. I find the behaviour of our national governments incomprehensible, and that of certain governments intolerable.

The five points I wish to make at the end of this debate are, firstly, that Eurocontrol is a functioning institution. There is no sensible reason for not making use of its facilities. Secondly, Eurocontrol was not created and equipped to such a magnificent technical standard so that it could be used to only a fraction of its true capacity. Thirdly, let me repeat on behalf of all the members of the Committee on Transport that Eurocontrol must be developed further and not dismantled. Fourthly, all responsible politicians and all responsible governments must do their level best to ensure the retention of Eurocontrol beyond the life of the current Convention, which expires in 1983. We call on our colleagues in the national parliaments to do everything in their power to take up the matter with their governments, join forces with us and tackle their national governments on the future of Eurocontrol. Fifthly, Eurocontrol is necessary and is essential to our survival.

I should like to take this opportunity to thank all those working for Eurocontrol for their efforts in the interests of air safety.

I would ask you, ladies and gentlemen, to give your support to Mr Janssen van Raay's report.

**President.** — Mr Seefeld, I shall convey your thanks to the management of Eurocontrol.

I call Mr Burke.

**Mr Burke, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, I wish to join all those who have congratulated the rapporteur, Mr Berkhouwer, who initiated this at the end of last year, the Committee on Transport, represented by so many speakers and particularly by its chairman, and this Parliament, which has returned once again, to my great pleasure, to the policy of air traffic control and air transport in general. I am particularly pleased because, during the course of my mandate as Commissioner for Transport, I have endeavoured perhaps pointedly for the first time in the history of the Community, by publishing a memorandum last year, to give some degree of leadership in this area, which up to now has not been given very much leadership, and therefore I am so pleased to have the moral, vocal and other support of the Members of this House. In fact, if the common transport policy is to make progress in the next few years, a lot will depend on the continued attention of Members of this House.

I should also like to congratulate the Members of the House on the informed and nuanced way in which

**Burke**

they drew distinctions between the competence of the Community and the rights and duties of the Community and the position of the permanent commission of ministers of Eurocontrol. Although it is not necessary to explain it to this House, for the purposes of public opinion, I should like to make it absolutely clear that the council of ministers we are talking about here is not the Council of Ministers of the European Community, with whom I have the great pleasure of conversing and legislating from time to time, but a separate body not under the control of the Community as such. Nevertheless, I welcome, speaking in my individual capacity, the great interest which is shown by Members of this House, and, indeed, I think it is quite proper for them to do so.

I will confine myself to one point of substance: point 14 of your motion for a resolution asks the Commission to undertake a study. I have great pleasure in indicating to you that I was able to anticipate this demand on 7 May 1979 when, replying to that debate and looking forward to the passage of the 1980 budget, I was able to say in relation to this study, and I quote: 'We also propose, provided that the budgetary funds are available in 1980, to have a study undertaken of the future capacity of the airways and controlled airspace systems in the Community as a parameter in the development of air transport services. This would be for its relevance to Community interest in the development of air transport services rather than an excursion into the technical operational field *per se*.' I confirm that this study will be done and, of course, I will be very glad, or I am sure my successor will be very glad, to share his thoughts as a result of this information with you. I would like to point out, of course, that there is no question in this matter of involving the Commission unnecessarily in activities which are proper either to Eurocontrol, to ICAO or to its European bodies, or to national authorities and I am glad also to note that there has been an increase of cooperation between our Commission services and Eurocontrol and that we have set up an agreement between the two bodies to cooperate on questions of common interest. May I also point out that the Commission is looking at the problem of air traffic control equipment which was mentioned in the course of the debate here, both from the production point of view and from the point of view of promoting compatibility between the system used in the different ATC centres in Europe. And finally, for the convenience of the House, might I be permitted to give a short index of contributions made by commissioners to debates on this important question of air traffic safety: May 1979, page 22; 12 October 1978, pages 283 and 284; 9 May 1978, pages 96 and 97; 15 October 1976, page 262 and 12 November 1975, pages 134 and 135, and I would like to draw attention to the excellent summary of the contributions made to the special hearing in Paris in March 1979, which dealt with this very important question. I congratulate the Parliament and look forward to the results which this input will have on the political will to move this whole question forward at

the appropriate levels and in the appropriate instances in the Community and thereby give me, as Commissioner for Transport, some extra help in developing the overall transport policy of the Community, particularly in aviation.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

I call Mr Van Minnen on a point of order.

**Mr Van Minnen.** — (NL) I wish to make a proposal. With all due respect for the other reports, the Peters report is one of the most important we have today. It will require a considerable amount of time. It is now ten minutes before the break for lunch. In my view, splitting up the discussion of this report by asking the rapporteur to introduce and explain it now, while the Chamber is empty, before we go on to the debate this afternoon, is a bad idea which is not going to help the quality of the debate. I propose that the sitting be suspended at this point and that we start with the Peters report when we resume this afternoon.

**President.** — Mr Van Minnen, we have a full agenda today and I think it would be better if we started the debate on the next item right away.

I call Mr van Minnen.

**Mr Van Minnen.** — (NL) Mr President, I want to say again that my group feels it would be a bad idea to start an important debate in this piecemeal fashion. You know the Socialist Group well enough to realize that we are never guilty of obstructive tactics and that we definitely have no truck with them. It would be simple to discuss a point of order with you until one o'clock and then to stop for lunch. I simply want to repeat my straightforward proposal that we interrupt the proceedings now and begin with the debate at three o'clock.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Peters.

**Mr Peters.** — (D) I am quite happy to introduce the report this afternoon, so that we can have an uninterrupted debate.

**President.** — I call Mrs Hoff.

**Mrs Hoff.** — (D) Mr President, I think it is senseless to bring my report forward because it is directly linked

Hoff

to the Peters report and should be considered thereafter. I should like to ask for my report to be considered after the Peters report, in accordance with the agenda.

**President.** — I call Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul.

**Mrs Wieczorek-Zeul.** — (D) Mr President, Sir Fred Catherwood is no longer present and he has asked me to stand in for him. On behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations I should like to request, since this is a matter in connection with the Peters report, that we deal with it in a joint debate this afternoon.

**President.** — The proceedings will now be suspended until 3 p.m.

The House will rise.

(The sitting was suspended at 12.55 p.m., and resumed at 3 p.m.)

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

*Vice-President*

**President.** — The sitting is resumed.

#### 8. Verification of credentials

**President.** — At its meeting today the Bureau verified the credentials of Mr Doublet, whose nomination had been announced earlier. Pursuant to Rule 3 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, the Bureau found that the appointment of Mr Doublet conformed with the provisions of the Treaties. The Bureau therefore proposes that Parliament ratify his mandate.

Since there are no objections, Mr Doublet's mandate is ratified.

#### 9. Urgent procedure

**President.** — I have received from Mr Klepsch and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD Group) and Mr Enright and others on behalf of the European Democratic Group a motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-318/80), with request for urgent debate pursuant to Rule 14 of the Rules of Procedure, on the serious violations of human rights and international law by the Argentinian military régime.

The reasons supporting this request for urgent debate are contained in the document itself.

I shall consult Parliament on this request at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

#### 10. Votes

**President.** — The next item is the vote on the motion for a resolution on which the debate has closed.

We shall consider the motion for a resolution contained in the *Janssen van Raay report (Doc. 1-274/80): Air traffic control system*.

I call Sir Peter Vanneck for an explanation of vote.

**Sir Peter Vanneck.** — Mr President, I would not normally give an explanation of vote but, thanks to Mr d'Angelosante and his comrades over there, I have, since the Luster report was not passed, the privilege of three minutes' speaking time whereas otherwise I would only have had 150 words on paper.

(Laughter and applause from the European Democratic Group)

However, as the Americans say, if you cannot break a racket, join it. And that is precisely what I am doing.

(Loud laughter)

And so I want to explain my vote, why I intend to support my friend, Mr Janssen van Raay, in his excellent report. Both as a pilot of by now some 35 years' experience and as a senior member of a licenced air pilots' and air navigators' organization, I feel that I have something to say — of course only in explaining my vote,

(Laughter)

Now, I have two points that I would like to make. One is the importance of maximizing the use of English in all circumstances of air traffic control, on the ground as well as in the air. There have recently been accidents which might well have been avoided, had pilots and controllers not, very naturally, reverted to their national vernacular. This is a point of safety, not just British chauvinism, and, of course, I would reassure my French colleagues that the French priority prefixes of *sécurité*, *panne* and *mayday* have become English as well as international control words.

The second point and the main reason why I wish to support my friend, Mr Janssen van Raay, is to emphasize the value of coordination to European defence. If we maintain full intra-European civilian air traffic

Vanneck

control, it must, for all countries of the Nine, be tied in with military considerations to identify extra-European incursions into our airspace. This is already done in several countries including my own . . .

**President.** — I would ask you, out of respect for the Rules, to conclude your explanation of vote. Otherwise you are in danger of making a crash landing!

*(Loud laughter and applause)*

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

### 11. Restructuring of the steel industry

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on two reports and an oral question:

— report (Doc. 1-215/80), drawn up by Mr Peters on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, on

- I — the communication from the Commission on the social aspects of the restructuring of the steel industry and
- II — the revised draft of a Commission decision concerning the creation of special temporary allowances to assist workers in the iron and steel industry under the Community restructuring plan;

— report (Doc. 1-266/80), drawn up by Mrs Hoff on behalf of the Committee on Budgets, on the

- proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-157/80) for a decision with regard to contributions to be granted to the European Coal and Steel Community out of the general budget of the European Communities;

— oral question with debate (Doc. 1-296/80), tabled by Sir Fred Catherwood and others on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations, to the Commission:

Subject: Relations between the EEC and the USA in the steel sector

1. What developments have taken place since April 1980 in relations between the EEC and the USA in the steel sector?
2. What is the present position of the US anti-dumping proceedings?
3. What actions does the Commission propose *vis-à-vis* the USA to defend effectively the interests of the Community steel industry?

I call Mr Peters.

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, in my introduction to the Committee on

Social Affairs and Employment's report on the social aspects of the restructuring of the steel industry, I shall refrain from discussing the details of the Commission's decision, which I already went into in my speech on 15 November during the debate on the interim report. Time is too short to allow me to go into any detail, so I shall confine myself to just a few political remarks.

The Committee on Social Affairs and Employment begs your support for its motion for a resolution. The aim of this resolution is, given the serious crisis Europe's steel industry now finds itself in and the massive restructuring measures which are now going on, to ensure that the workers do not suffer unduly from the economic measures and that they are given social assistance rather than being required to carry the can for the past failures of management and the European Community. This social assistance should be available in the form of early retirement, a reduction in overtime, improved working conditions and working hours and the reorganization of shift work. Hitherto, social aid could only be granted within the terms of the ECSC Treaty when jobs were irrevocably lost. This is an important social measure. It is now up to us to go far beyond the facilities so far available to us and to grant aid even when the job as such remains in being. Jobs can only be saved if more workers are enabled to do the work available, for instance by various means of shortening working time, by early retirement or a reduction in overtime. The steel industry remains one of the European Community's staple industries, and it is essential to the well-being of the Community that such staple industries are not allowed to go under. The Community has a vital interest in keeping the steel industry viable, and that can only be done by modernization which should not, however, be pushed through at the workers' expense as a result of higher unemployment. That is the point of this motion for a resolution.

Attempts have been made to eliminate the steel industry entirely in certain regions. We have only to think of what is going on at the moment in the British steel industry, where 50 000 out of a total of 150 000 workers are to be made redundant in 1980. The Consett plant will be closed entirely, and further closures are planned in Wales. There was also a plan at one time to close all the steelworks in the Saar, although this was prevented by a combined modernization programme set up by the government, the trade unions and the workers. As regards the Commission's proposal, we, the European Parliament, must make it clear to the Council that, while accepting the need for modernization and improved competitiveness, we can only agree to such measures if they are accompanied by appropriate social measures.

A second point on a different subject is that there are certain people in the steel industry and the Council of Ministers who have declared themselves against these social measures because they see them as the beginnings of aid to threatened industries. I would not deny

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 197 of 4. 8. 1980.

**Peters**

that these social measures are indeed a first element of a social industrial policy on the part of the European Community — the kind of policy which has never existed before — and it would be disastrous for this House not to give its support to such a first step. In the campaign leading up to direct elections, we gave our word that the European Community would be not only a Community of farmers, businessmen and entrepreneurs, but also a Community of workers.

In conclusion, I call on the European Parliament and all the political groups represented here to give their unstinting support to the central points of the motion for a resolution, to cast their vote for the proposed social measures and to call on the Council to put this decision into practice without further delay and to make the necessary funds available immediately. We have an obligation in this respect. Let us now fulfil that obligation.

**President.** — I call Mr Albers on a point of order.

**Mr Albers.** — (NL) I just want to say, Mr President, that in spite of the importance of his report the rapporteur has only five minutes in which to introduce it. This is quite wrong in my view. There are reports on the agenda which have little significance and others which have a great deal of significance.

I want the Bureau to know that this is not really the right way to go about things.

**President.** — I agree that there is very little time, Mr Albers, but I must remind you that you went along with this decision on Monday.

I call Mrs Hoff.

**Mrs Hoff, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the report I have drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Budgets is concerned with the financing of restructuring measures in the coal and steel industries. My report is numbered 1-266/80, and the relevant proposal from the Commission 1-157/80. The importance of this subject lies in the fact that the restructuring measures for the iron and steel industries as described in Mr Peters' report will all come to nought if there is no effective means of providing finance for them. We should therefore be on our guard against approving social policy activities without expending at least the same amount of energy on finding the wherewithal to finance these activities.

This is not the first time the means of finance available to the European coal and steel industry have given cause for great concern. For a long time now the Member States have been incapable of creating a solid financial basis for this oldest of the European Communities. The operational budget in particular is getting

thinner and thinner and this is a particularly worrying process because it is precisely that aspect of the budget which is responsible for financing the social measures. The deficit could be met by increasing the ECSC levy, which currently amounts to 0.29 % on all coal and steel products. But that would be an absurd step to take, because it would mean that the industries affected by the crisis would be left to their own devices to drag themselves out of their current difficulties. Parliament is therefore right in refusing to increase the ECSC levy. As a result, the necessary finance was collected in the past by begging and pleading instead of having a sensible means of financing integrated in the budget itself. Instead of being linked to the *ad hoc* contribution quota, this rough-and-ready system leaves every Member State to contribute as much as it can or wishes. The result is that the coffers are always emptier than was originally planned, and consequently the social measures suffer more and more swinging cuts. The situation as regards the extraordinary budget resources from the floating of ECSC loans was rather better, but — as was mentioned earlier — these funds cannot be used for social measures.

In previous years, the Commission has always used legal pretexts to reject the idea of financing the ECSC operational budget by way of an appropriation from the General Budget, but last year, as a result of persistent pressure from the European Parliament, it at last abandoned this stance. The ECSC is entitled by Article 49 of the ECSC Treaty to receive gifts. Moreover, the European Parliament last year considered the possibility of implementing the social measures described by Mr Peters as part of the Commission's social policy rather than under the terms of the ECSC Treaty, in other words, financing the measures directly from the General Budget without transferring the required funds to the ECSC. You may recall that Parliament decides in the end to opt for the funds to be transferred after all to prevent a conflict of interests prior to the fusion of the ECSC and General Budgets. The Committee on Budgets intends to abide by Parliament's earlier decision, and in principle we are in favour of the transfer of budgetary resources from the General Budget to the ECSC operational budget. This is the thinking behind the Commission proposal I referred to earlier.

I should now like to move on to the central point on which the Committee on Budgets does not see eye to eye with the Commission. By virtue of the newly created Chapter 54 of the Commission budget and the approval of this budgetary item, the Commission has sufficient legal powers to effect the transfer.

The Committee on Budgets does not agree with the Commission that an additional legal act pursuant to Article 235 of the EEC Treaty is needed over and above Article 49 of the ECSC Treaty and the proper approval of the budget by both arms of the budgetary authority.

**Hoff**

What, after all, would be the point of this? The necessary legal provisions exist on both sides — EEC as well as ECSC. There is therefore no need for additional provisions or commentaries. The Committee on Budgets has thereby also adopted a definite stance as regards the classification of resources from Chapter 54, which are clearly non-compulsory. The fluctuating *ad hoc* payments by the Member States in the past are proof enough of the non-compulsory and non-binding nature of the financing of the ECSC budget. The Member States should therefore not try to change the classification of expenditure in any form whatsoever by calling for an additional and unnecessary legislative decision under Article 235. Nor should the Commission seek to encourage this dubious undertaking. Even from the political point of view, the Commission and the Council can relax, because the rejection of the proposed additional legislative act unnecessary in no way affects the decision-making rights of the Council. Its only effect would be to eliminate a technocratic barrier standing in the way of the implementation of a clear budgetary decision. In any case, the Council has a full range of legislative powers to enable it to assess and, if necessary, modify the social measures described by Mr Peters...

*(The President asked the speaker to conclude her remarks)*

These measures can only be implemented on the basis of a unanimous decision by the Council pursuant to Article 95 of the ECSC Treaty. Allow me to comment briefly on what the Member of the Commission responsible for the budget, Mr Tugendhat, said this morning and to remind you that the Committee on Budgets followed a clear policy line right through the recently concluded 1980 budgetary procedure despite the bitterly restrictive attitude of the Council. The commitment appropriations of 100 million EUA and the payment appropriations of 30 million EUA voted by Parliament in the first reading on 7 November 1979 were cut in the new budgetary proposals submitted by the Commission on 29 February 1980 to 30 million EUA commitment and payment appropriations, and in the final phase of the budgetary procedure it was only with great difficulty that we managed to rescue at least a token entry. The result is meagre...

**President.** — I am afraid, Mrs Hoff, that you have exceeded your allotted speaking time by more than two minutes. The other Members have a right to speak too. I am afraid your microphone will have to be switched off.

I call Mr Van Minnen to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Van Minnen.** — (NL) Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group, I should like to begin by congratulating Mr Peters on his report. This praise is not

intended to simply 'keep it in the family', as it were, but is a genuine expression of respect for the thorough way in which we think the rapporteur has done his job. As you know, the Socialist Group has tabled six amendments to the rapporteur's motion for a resolution to bring out what we feel is the real issue, namely, the need to provide effective support for workers, who should not be required to bear the brunt of a crisis in the steel industry which is not of their making and for which they should certainly not be held responsible. We therefore want to go further than the rapporteur has tried to do in denouncing the dismantling of whole industries in major iron and steel areas as socially unacceptable, which is why — unlike certain others in this House — we want to leave no doubt whatever as to the fact that we are seeking to bring about a genuine reduction in working time. Of course, the form this reduction in working time should take will have to be discussed with the trade unions concerned. The Socialist Group's preference quite definitely is for a reduction in the duration of the working day, on the grounds that this is the only way men and women can be given an equal opportunity to participate together in public and family life.

In short we wholeheartedly support this motion for a resolution, but we should like to have a rather more precise formulation — hence the amendments we have tabled. Thousands of workers in the Community's steel industry are pinning their hopes on the resolution which can — if acted upon — lead to pioneering work in the social no man's land, which is what the Common Market has so far largely amounted to. This resolution must not be allowed to remain a dead letter, because on it depends the last chance we have to preserve our social credibility. If we adopt this resolution, we shall be expressing our support for the Commission's proposals, which also means above all proposals which are not spelt out in the resolution, but without which the resolution would amount to nothing but empty words — that is to say, proposals for the needed to finance these special measures. In budgetary terms, what this amounts to is 30 million EUA this year and 100 million EUA for the next three years.

We thus support the Commission's policy, but that no longer seems to be the essential point. The question now is how far the Commission is prepared to support its own policy. To what extent is it committed to its own proposals? What really matters is not the lip service paid by a Member of the Commission who is undoubtedly at pains to say what he can but rather the fact of the situation, and — much as it grieves me to say so — one of these is that the Commission, when it could have given steelworkers in the Community some prospect of a slight improvement in their lot, has left them in the lurch again. We realize that the Council is responsible for blocking certain items in the budget and also — quite apart from the financial aspects — for blocking the whole structure of this programme.

We also realize that Parliament itself is equally guilty, in particular the Christian Democrat Group, which



### Van Minnen

goes to such lengths in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment to show off its 'worker' side but then — as soon as it comes to making the required funds available — to a man shows its true face as a right-wing group by calmly and mercilessly voting against these items in the budget. That is the kind of sense of responsibility that must be roundly condemned, especially after the absurd accusations we Socialist had heaped upon us yesterday by the Christian Democrats. Their behaviour is quite simply two-faced.

The true counterpart to the European Parliament is, however the Commission, which has to account here for its activities in implementing European policies. We have to judge the Commission by its actions, but the Commission clearly aims far too low when it comes to the very least degree of perseverance. It became clear to us behind the scene how much the Commission had to force itself even to have the modest sum of 30 million EUA reinstated in the draft budget for 1980. Out in the open we saw how readily the Commission went along with the Council's arrogantly striking out this item. Today, indeed, our assessment of the Commission's lack of resolve has been confirmed by the fact that in the new draft budget for 1981, not a cent, not a pfennig, not a franc, not a single EUA has been set aside for this programme. The social element is not even the balancing item in the budget any longer — it has simply vanished into thin air. That, in the opinion of the Socialist Group, is absolutely scandalous.

What are we to think of a Commission which is prepared to sit back and allow the appropriations needed to finance this programme to be simply deleted from the budget? What are we to think of a Commissioner who is prepared to sit back and watch the life being squeezed out of his social policy? Why did the Commission not alert Parliament in time and why did the Commissioner not come hurrying to Parliament of his own accord to tell us that this was unacceptable and that he was drawing the necessary conclusions. Whatever happened to the resolute stance which would have been the only proper reaction? That resolute stance is conspicuous by its absence! The European electorate is often told that we should have something akin to a European government with European ministers.

This being so, let us take the comparison a little further. What self-respecting Minister of Social Affairs would remain in office if he were given no room for manoeuvre whatsoever in his policy field? By not resigning, he would in fact show himself to be a political lightweight with every chance of aspiring to become a European Commissioner and thus act as a sort of doormat for those who really wield the power. The Commission would then truly be an executive in the worst sense of the word. If the Commission is not willing or able to draw the necessary conclusions regarding either the Council or Parliament, we

ourselves should not hesitate to draw the necessary conclusions regarding the Commission. If only on the strength of the draft budget for 1981, the Commission deserves to be sent packing forthwith.

Finally, let me remind you that this is not an academic debate. What we are talking about here are plans and commitments which will quite literally directly affect the lives of thousands of workers.

If these plans we are now discussing — although they only exist in concrete form at present for the steel industry — are ever put into practice, they will serve as an example for other branches of industry.

What, after all, is the use to the workers of lofty phrases in which everything is said to be of the greatest possible importance when we already know that it will all just remain so much verbiage in document PE 64.568/fin? What can workers affected by the steel crisis go out and buy for a token entry in the budget? They will finish even worse off than Johan Cruyff who, in his declining years, had to explain to the baker that he really was the famous footballer! The rapporteur said that it was scandalous that surplus production in agriculture costs the Community thousands of millions of EUA every year. That is indeed scandalous, but in Wales and in Consett, in Lorraine and Charleroi, in Southern Italy and along the North Sea coast, the whole idea of Europe becomes a sick joke when such a pretentious programme as this cannot even come up with half a loaf and is in other words a mere empty shell. The Community prides itself on its policy for guaranteeing food supplies, otherwise known as 'our Common Agricultural Policy'. Milk and meat producers are coddled and cosseted, but this very same Community refuses to lift a finger to safeguard jobs in the steel industry, despite the fact that the ECSC Treaty is the oldest of the Community Treaties. We regard this programme as an absolute minimum — no more than a modest first step towards the European social policy for industry we must ultimately have. The Commission's weak-kneed political stance contrasts starkly with the rock-hard attitude of the steelmakers, whose reaction clearly shows that — apart from early retirement at the company's cost — they are prepared to make no further concessions and are most certainly not prepared to safeguard jobs, which should after all be the prime concern. It will of course cost money to put this plan into effect, but to do nothing at all will cost even more in terms of money and in terms of social tension. What we have is a token entry in the budget. The Socialist Group regards this token entry as a gesture of contempt for the workers. We must keep hammering away at it to get the money needed for this social structural programme included in the budget forthwith.

**President.** — I call Mr Van der Gun to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

**Mr Van der Gun.** — (NL) Mr President, I should like to begin by saying that I go along with the remarks made by Mr Albers regarding the agenda. There is no further need for you to reply to this point, as you have already done so, but I must say that it is significant that so little time should be made available for our first discussion of this first attempt to tackle unemployment at European level. I agree that this is clearly what we decided, and I bear my share of responsibility for that decision. That does not mean to say, however, Mr President, that it is not in itself highly regrettable...

**President.** — I do not see how you can now regret something which was accepted unopposed on Monday. If there were any objections, Members should have paid attention and stood up and said so on Monday.

**Mr Van der Gun.** — (NL) ... Mr President, let us not waste time discussing this point. The time available for this debate is far too valuable. I should like to continue by addressing a remark to the previous speaker. I must say in all conscience that I was left to wonder what steelworkers' interests were being served in the present situation by the way in which Mr Van Minnen judged it necessary to attack the Commission and just about everybody else. I must say as a Christian Democrat that the level of his remarks was such that we do not intend to demean ourselves by commenting further on what the honourable Member had to say.

Mr President, we believe that this subject, as it stands on the agenda, is of very great importance. What is at stake is whether or not we shall succeed in adopting a European approach to the unemployment problem.

In this particular case, we are concerned with the steel industry. Of course, if it is possible at a given moment to do something for the steel industry, it would be difficult to deny the possibility of setting up similar activities for other branches of industry in similar straits.

We are therefore grateful to the Commission for having taken this initiative. Admittedly, it has taken somewhat longer than we would have liked, but I think that if this House can now reach a corresponding decision, we shall have achieved a great deal. After all, a strengthening of the social nature of the Community cannot in itself be a bad thing. On the contrary, I believe that a stronger social policy is of fundamental importance in giving Europe a more human face, and this can be a step in that direction. However, we must then realize — and in this respect my views differ sharply from those of the honourable Member — that this is not something Parliament can tackle alone. Not even the Commission and Parliament together, not even an alliance of Council,

Commission and Parliament can make any real impression here. The fact is that the two sides of industry have an extremely important — not to say, decisive — role to play in this context. Unfortunately, consultation procedures at European level on this sort of problem are hardly working, despite all Mr Vredeling's efforts to set the ball rolling. The main problem here is the attitude of the employers' organization, UNICE, which leaves a lot to be desired. They say at one moment that they are prepared to discuss the issue of a reduction in working time but then, in a broader context, they point out that in any case it will not be possible to draw up an agreement at European level. They will be saying shortly that they think the subject should not be tackled at European level, but only at the very lowest level in the individual Member States' industries. That is the situation at the moment as regards the dialogue between employers and workers at European level.

One of the main merits of the initiative in its present form is that it gives Parliament a chance to do its bit to break the logjam and restore some prospect of progress. In other words, we in Parliament must create a framework, give a lead and clear the way for further progress. However, one of the facts of life we shall have to learn to live with — no matter what political party we may belong to — is that the final choice between the various possibilities will be made not by Parliament but, in practice, by the two sides of industry. That is something on which both sides are in complete agreement. The ETUC is just as passionate an advocate of free collective bargaining as the employers sometimes are. What right do we in this House have then to interfere and try to tell the two sides what attitudes to adopt?

I am convinced that if we take this line, in the steel industry as elsewhere, we shall succeed not in solving the problems but simply in blocking the whole situation. We must accept and respect the independence of the two sides of industry. I am not just talking through my hat. I have had detailed discussions with various people, including the leaders of the ETUC.

Here too, there is no difference of opinion whatsoever. The possibilities now open to us under the Commission's proposal offer some hope of getting the dialogue going again and achieving concrete results. However, it is of fundamental importance that we should not get bogged down in political trivialities, but should try to get as large a majority as possible in this House in favour of a limited statement of principle recommending the general direction, to be taken, without specifying exactly how the end should be achieved. That is a matter for the two sides of industry.

I should like to thank Mr Peters most sincerely for the trouble he has gone to as rapporteur in trying to distil this general philosophy into a programme which will command as large a majority as possible in this House.

**Van der Gun**

I should like to repeat in public what I have already said in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, that we are particularly appreciative of his efforts. His preparatory work on the report was extremely thorough and has given us a chance to do something more specific than simply mouthing hollow phrases to tackle the enormous problems facing the workers in the steel industry.

**President.** — I call Mr Spencer to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Spencer.** — Mr President, I am delighted to follow my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, and glad to see him in such good form, given that over the last six months he has had to chair some peculiarly difficult, at times intemperate and, certainly at the beginning, ill-informed and partisan debates in the committee. After nearly six months we are perhaps sadder, certainly wiser and, I hope, rather more realistic.

Before I turn to the motion for a resolution, I regret that I must, despite my respect for Mr Peters, make a brief comment about the explanatory statement. The explanatory statement is a child of that difficult winter of argument, and it contains statements which are in a major way different from those contained in the resolution. In particular, it contains statements about the British steel industry on which I disagreed on a factual basis with the rapporteur and which I drew to his attention. I am only sad that he has not corrected those factual errors, even though there is a series of Commission notes peppering his report which contradict some of the figures on which he bases his arguments. So, on the question of the amount of consultation in the British steel industry, on the job creation record of British Steel Ltd. and on the actual figures of job losses proposed, I have to take issue with the rapporteur. While I am delighted to say that my group will take great pleasure in voting for the Peters report, we do so without in any way implying support for the explanatory statement.

The purpose of our amendments, if I can put it that way, is to look at what Europe can actually do in a situation of profound social problems in Europe's steel industry. We heard Mrs Clwyd talk this morning about Legionnaire's disease, caused by humidifiers and the rest. There is also a Parliamentarians' disease, which makes parliamentarians suffer from a tendency to interfere where they should not, to raise hopes which they cannot fund and to make speeches which ease their consciences but do not actually ease the situation. Our amendments are designed to slim down the resolution, to concentrate on achieving by means of this resolution measures which can be pushed forward and which can be funded in the very near future. We believe passionately that Europe can do

something in this field. It is always bound to be small compared to the efforts of a similar nature made by the Member States, but Europe can do various things to promote expertise and, in certain instances, to provide money.

Our amendment to paragraph 10 seeks to focus the attention of the House on the provisions for early retirement and to beg the House not to insist on the various elements of work-sharing, particularly the fifth shift and allied measures which we believe will cause these provisions to be further delayed in the Council. In our opinion, half a loaf, even in this situation, is better than no bread. We want to try to smooth away the obstacles to the progress of this financing and press for what is essential. Similarly, on paragraph 11 we resent the reference to early retirement as a form of concealed dismissal. That is unfair in an industry, certainly in Britain, where a very large number of steelworkers are older than the average worker in other steel industries in the Community.

On paragraph 13 we are quite pleased, and indeed keen, to look at a structural reduction in temporary overtime, but we do not believe that that should be a case for a uniform Community regulation. These are peculiarly national problems, certainly in the United Kingdom and Ireland, and I do not believe that they can be solved by anyone other than the social partners in those countries. I have already referred in passing to the work-sharing element, and on paragraph 15 we shall seek to ask this House, while recognizing the social desirability of shorter hours, not to commit itself to specific numbers which will, yet again, make this report difficult for the Council to accept.

We particularly regard as gratuitously unhelpful the references in paragraphs 21 and 22 to the different social partners. It seems to me that if you are having a dialogue, you do not necessarily improve its quality by cheering for one side and shouting for the other. On paragraph 24 we do not quite see how aid can be back-dated. The problem is quite simply: how far do you backdate? Do you start refunding monies to countries who were making structural changes in 1976 or 1966 or 1956? So we, I think, would accept a date, maybe 1978-1979, but it has to be a fairly recent date.

The crux of the matter, of course, is what money we are actually going to put on the line at the end of the day. That is covered under paragraph 23. We shall be listening extremely closely to what the Commissioner has to say at the end of this debate. Ideally — and I make no apology for this — we would like to see the full 100 million units of account put behind this programme. We have suggested a split of 60 to 40 million units of account. I fear sadly that this is going to prove unrealistic. So we shall be listening to hear exactly what the Commission says, both about total figures involved and about the way they are to fund it.

Spencer

I am not going into the details of the Hoff report here, but only to say it is in line with our general attitude. We are not interested in a theological debate about where the money is to come from. We want the money, we want it legally, but we do not believe we should stand too much upon the dignity of Parliament or details of the Treaty of Paris, if that is going to hold up money to steel workers in crisis. The aim of our amendments therefore is to simplify, to concentrate the mind and to speed the actual process of money getting into the hands of steelworkers across Europe. None of those people working in the industries of Europe will thank you if, for reasons of parliamentary self-importance or futuristic ideological squabbles, we delay these measures further than they have already been delayed.

**President.** — I call Mr Ansart to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

**Mr Ansart.** — (F) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, first of all let me give my opinion on the root of the problem. It is quite clear that the Community has no social policy. This is something my colleagues and I have repeated time and again before this House.

No aid can ever repair the enormous damage already inflicted deliberately on our national steel industry, on our country and on the regions concerned, for instance those of Northern and Eastern France, where not only the steel industry but also the coal and ore industries have been forsaken and sacrificed to private interests.

The French and British steel industries have been severely hit by restructuring.

In France, where between 1975 and 1978 over 60 000 workers already lost their jobs in this sector, today more than 100 000 jobs have been lost or are about to be lost under the redeployment plan — the so-called anti-crisis plan — thought up by big business in the steel industry.

This plan, let it be said, will mainly benefit West Germany and the West German steel cartel, which has been set up again even though this was forbidden.

Whereas by 1982 French steel capacity will have dropped 4.6 % compared to 1974, that of the Federal Republic of Germany will have risen more than 11 %, that is an output of 64 million tonnes for Germany as against 28 million tonnes for France. On this reckoning France will no longer be a big steel power in 1982.

A big industry is a condition of a country's greatness and independence. There has been a serious reduction in employment in Northern and Eastern France as a result of the measures taken by the European Community, in agreement with the French Government,

which denies nothing to the big business interests in the steel industry; they have received very large subsidies which they have not used to modernize an industry and plants which are still perfectly sound and profitable; some of these plants provided the livelihood of tens of thousands of people (30 000 at least) in the Valenciennes area alone, of which I have the honour to be the national deputy.

The implementation of the Coal and Steel Community's plans had already led to the closure of all the pits one after the other in this region.

Now the steel plan is killing off the steelworks, in particular that at Denain, where 6 000 people have just been laid off, precipitating a disaster unprecedented in that region.

Thus thirty years of European policy implemented by the French government have sapped the lifeblood of this region, one of the biggest industrial regions in our country.

In such circumstances, one cannot but share the disquiet and distress of tens of thousands of people, but also the indignation of all the people who condemn this policy.

All this has been done without consulting us, the elected representatives. As always, we are faced with a *fait accompli*. None of our demands, none of our proposals have been taken into consideration. The European steel plan was imposed on us. The government, for its part, flew once more to the aid of the strongest. It allocated 7 000 million francs to enable the steel industry bosses to leave. They left, having made their fortunes, leaving us with our unemployed and our young people, and this in a region which made their fortune and which they have destroyed. This is the worst case of squandering manpower, intelligence and production plant since the war.

Today, just as I was preparing to come to the part-session of this Parliament, I learnt that one of the jewels of French rolling stock, the Franco-Belgian works, is also threatened in this same region, with the possibility of a loss of 12 000 jobs in the company and among its subcontractors.

And we are told that this is not the end of it!

We are told that French steel is not competitive and not profitable. Is it profitable to kill off entire regions and turn them into wastelands of unemployment?

In fact, the policy of austerity being pursued by the Community of the Nine and by each of the governments which comprise it has led to a massive resurgence of unemployment in our country, such as we experienced in our youth and which we believed banished for ever. Only very recently we were told: profit means investment, investment means employ-

## Ansart

ment. Profits have never been better, but for the most part they are being invested abroad while at home works are being closed.

In these circumstances, how do you expect us to support the measures proposed to us today? What I deplore is the attempt to make us accept this waste and the fact that workers are told: 'I've taken your job, destroyed your livelihood and that of your family, but here is compensation to help you swallow this bitter pill'. Nothing doing!

Mr Peters' and Mrs Hoff's reports, I regret to say, do not condemn this restructuring, these dismissals and this waste, against which we are the only ones in this House to protest. We were called prophets of doom, but now nobody would dare to show his face in the regions which have been destroyed.

By proposing aid once the damage has been done, the reports before us today try to gain acceptance for these plans which the workers reject.

No compensation could, in fact, repair the damage which has been done and which is about to be continued.

These plans have done enough harm: they must be stopped, they must be challenged. This is the opinion of workers and their trade unions. What the workers want from us is not the sort of assistance that is given to the poor and unfortunate. They want work. They are demanding a basic right. They expect us to side with them against the dismissals, against the closure of their firms, and to support them in their demand for new conditions of work! They expect us to speak out unequivocally, and to fight unhesitatingly to fulfil the demands of our times: reduction of working time to 35 hours, as was promised during the election campaign; creation of a fifth team for shift work; earlier retirement, with special arrangements for workers doing arduous tasks; measures designed to provide employment for young persons — very often unemployed before ever having worked — and to give them modern vocational training.

All these are job-creating measures.

For my part, I have made a study of the large steelworks, like that of Usinor at Dunkirk, which employs 10 000 people. The measures which I propose would create 2 300 new jobs. As it is, France will soon have two million unemployed and in Europe the figure will soon be seven million!

As long as Europe does not have an image of social progress, of the right to work without which there can be no talk of freedom, it will never have the support of millions of workers.

Having said this, there can be no question of our refusing the funds which the workers have struggled

to obtain. However, neither does this imply acceptance of the plans to restructure European big business, because it is France and the workers that are the victims. And we are told that these plans are now going to be applied to steelworks still in operation in order to rationalize employment, which means, if we are not careful, that dozens of new jobs will be done away with. As long as we stand our ground, we believe that we can wage a good struggle and that viable solutions do exist, but we also believe that, in the framework of European cooperation, France's policy — including its economic policy — must, as we have always stressed, be laid down, not in Brussels, but in Paris and nowhere else.

**President.** — I call Mr Calvez to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Calvez.** — (*F*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the representatives of the Liberal and Democratic Group in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment did not vote in favour of the report and the motions for resolution tabled by Mr Peters. The 25-point list in the motion for a resolution in the report obviously contains things which are acceptable and others which are not. The Peters report contains some observations by the Commission of the European Communities on the actual text which try to give a more accurate picture. I think that this should be pointed out to those who have been unable to read in full the 71 pages of the text submitted to Parliament. Moreover, Mr Peters referred to it a few moments ago.

Today there is no use crying over spilt milk and regretting that the Commission did not act, did not take steps, when it was aware of the trend in steel production and the steel markets and when restructuring was dragging its feet in some Member States. What else could the Commission do? Is there in fact sufficient political will on the part of the Member States to support the Commission's initiatives? I doubt it.

Of course we recognize the need for a coherent industrial policy which is a fundamental factor in the progress of European integration. It is discussed each year, but nothing more. Sooner or later this problem will have to be dealt with seriously.

We have all, for various reasons, expressed sympathy for the difficult situation of steelworkers and of workers in other industrial sectors close to that branch of our industry, in regions where there is no or very little scope for transfer to other jobs. However, one cannot transform a rolling mill worker into a precision engineering specialist once he has reached a certain age. Matters are not simple and cannot be settled easily from one day to the next. We favour a well-designed regional development policy, leading to a policy of full and better employment.

**Calvez**

I would point out to the rapporteur that I am, like him, a trade unionist who has worked in a company, but one who respects the opinions of others, including those who do not think as I do. Are you not favouring the International Metalworkers' Federation unduly? Other trade union organizations have also worked to alleviate the effects of the crisis in the steel industry. This must be acknowledged. Are you not also lacking somewhat in objectivity, Mr Peters, when you state in paragraph 21 of your motion for a resolution that the employers in the iron and steel industry are either critical of or reject the Commission's proposal, with the exception of the provisions for early retirement?

I know — and I quote my sources — that at the ECSC Consultative Committee meeting of 19 September 1978 its members voted, with only one abstention, for a resolution on the social aspects of steel policy, entrusting to the Sub-Committee for Labour Problems the task of studying, in liaison with the EEC Commission, all the aspects of the social programme and the measures to be taken to implement it, including new patterns of shift or team work, shorter working hours and restrictions on overtime.

And on 9 March 1979, at another ECSC Consultative Committee meeting, all those present — with the exception of three German producers — declared that there was an indissoluble link between the policy of restructuring, reconversion and readaptation and the social repercussions of steel policy. These same members declared that the Commission should be provided with sufficient financial resources, should interpret Article 56 in its widest sense and apply Article 96 of the ECSC Treaty where necessary. Lastly, all the members, with the exception — as I said a moment ago — of three German producers, supported the Commission's initiatives to overcome the effects of the steel crisis. So as to clear up any uncertainty between us, let me ask the competent Member of the Commission to tell us if we have reason to be astonished at the attitude of employers in the iron and steel industry. Moreover we shall support the amendments seeking to delete Articles 21 and 22 of the motion for a resolution.

I think that we should not embark either on courses such as the abolition of overtime by means of a uniform Community regulation. If it is necessary to make adjustments to working time, let us leave this to management and labour in the widest sense of the term, and not solely to the International Metalworkers' Federation. There are other trade union organizations which also represent wage earners, just as some members of Parliament, even if they are in a minority, represent citizens. In my view, it is in line with the most elementary justice that they should have the right to speak and negotiate.

To conclude my speech, let me add that our group, aware of the importance of this problem, in particular from human point of view, is ready to allocate the

hundred million EUA proposed by the Commission in the general budget, but it cannot accept the wording of the Peters report. In an exceptional situation — to alleviate the social effects of new reductions in manpower, which are in fact already looming on the horizon — exceptional measures must be taken and non-reimbursable aid granted to those who have launched or will launch large-scale programmes for restructuring their iron and steel industries.

This is why, in agreement with my colleague, Georges Donnez, I would express reservations on the report by Mrs Hoff, who regards as inappropriate a proposal for a Commission decision with regard to contributions to be granted to the ECSC out of the general budget.

The conclusion of Mrs Hoff's motion for a resolution is somewhat hard. I consider it necessary, in view of the special situation in the steel sector, to establish legal bases for the measures which are the subject of our debate by entering a heading in the general budget.

On the oral question with debate by Sir Fred Catherwood, let me simply express my agreement as co-signatory, with some of my fellow members of the Liberal and Democratic Group, of a motion for a resolution.

**President.** — I call Miss De Valera to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Miss De Valera.** — Mr President, when we debated Mr Peters' interim report on the social aspects of restructuring in the iron and steel industry last November, we were then able, as Mr Peters pointed out, to take a general decision of principle on this issue. On behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats I now wish to thank Mr Peters for presenting us today with his final and comprehensive report on the social problems facing the iron and steel industry.

From the outset I would like to say that my group supports any measures aimed at relieving the great social pressure confronting those who are fighting desperately to retain their jobs in the steel industry in the Community. However, we cannot associate ourselves with the sentiments expressed in the paragraph of the resolution, which talks of the delays in the budget, when it was this Parliament which rejected the 1980 budget in December last. Originally, it was intended to have 100 m EUA transferred from the general Community budget to the ECSC budget to finance specific social aid measures. This was then reduced to a proposed 30 m EUA for 1980. 30 m EUA is a totally inadequate sum to achieve the designed impact because of the delays in settling the budget, and it has ended up as a token entry in the 1980 budget. Token gestures are poor consolation for the

**De Valera**

50 000 men and women who lost their jobs in 1979 and a further estimated 65 000 jobs which will be lost in the period 1980 to 1983. What is needed is economic convergence.

In the Group of European Progressive Democrats we have consistently recognized the need for the Community to work towards such convergence. A comprehensive steel programme is crucial in this context. Measures to counteract the steel crisis are largely at national level. Under present circumstances national subsidies are likely to be continued. These subsidies are likely to be divergent and divergence harms the economy of this Community. Unless the Regional, Social and ECSC Funds work together towards convergence, our less developed regions will be further handicapped and social progress will be eroded. At the present time one has to admit that the outlook is bleak. The drop in demand for steel and consumer goods, the reduction in industrial outlets, stiffer competition, particularly from developing countries, excessive production capacity in the Community and a fall in orders from within the Community of 7.8 % and from the Third World countries of 17.9 % are the harsh realities. Extensive cutbacks have resulted in serious social unrest. Many steel producing areas are dependent on one industry. Financial rescue measures to attract other industries have failed. Social measures in the Community have failed, where for example, workers have agreed to compensation but have not found alternative work. In many of the steel-producing areas there is no alternative work. Not only families, but whole communities are faced with redundancy.

The Irish steel industry is small, maybe insignificant, in comparison to the steel industry in other parts of the Community, but none the less very important to us, particularly in the Cork region. Like the other Member States, we in Ireland are presently involved in a modernization programme. Over a five-year period ending in 1979 Irish Steel lost 9.3 million punts which, for translation purposes, can be referred to as 9.3 million Irish pounds. Last November it was estimated that Irish Steel was likely to lose another 5 million punts at the very least, before breaking even. Despite these likely losses in the immediate future, the State-owned company has been pushing ahead with an ambitious programme. This restructuring is not expected to increase the 770 strong workforce in the sector. However, neither is it expected to result in the loss of jobs. Last November Mr Peters said, and I quote: 'efficiency must not be bought at the workers' expense by means of higher and higher levels of unemployment. In other words, the process of modernization must go hand in hand with social and welfare measures for the workers affected.' We fully support this view. But this principle must also be extended to other sectors of industry. There are serious unemployment problems in other sectors for which the type of aid afforded by the ECSC Treaty is not available.

I therefore feel it is necessary to make the following general reservations. Firstly, the proposed measures would create a precedent for other sectors, whereas, because of their effect on the economy, such measures should be seen only in the context of general employment policy in the Community. Secondly, regional imbalances would result from granting new aid to the iron and steel sector, which is located mainly in the most developed regions of the Community. Thirdly, even more pronounced imbalances would make themselves felt between the broad ranges of measures confined to the iron and steel sector and the measures available to other sectors. Fourthly, the financial effects would create difficulties for Member States with adverse budget situations and which have also to cope with unemployment problems in other sectors not receiving Community aid. The steel industry could be considered a test case for the Community. We must strive to overcome this crisis under very difficult circumstances I agree, but unless we adjust within the framework of the present and future economic restraints the type of special measures which are being suggested in Mr Peters' report will not solve anything. At best, they will alleviate on a temporary basis a situation which does not show any foreseeable sign of improvement.

Having said this, I am fully conscious that we are not just talking about industry or the economy. We are talking about the human factor, which is paramount. I therefore have to admit that any measures, however temporary or inadequate they may be, that contribute to alleviating the suffering, hardship and anguish of tens of thousands of European workers can only be highly commendable. I will vote for this motion.

**President.** — I call Mrs Dekker.

**Mrs Dekker.** — (NL) Mr President, by refusing to adopt the proposals put forward by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on the inclusion in the 1980 budget of 30 million EUA to finance social measures in the steel industry, the majority in this House has shown a very disappointing lack of perseverance given its earlier attitude to the subject. Unfortunately, this new stance is not restricted to this particular proposal put forward by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment — we have seen the same kind of thing in response to proposals on anti-poverty measures and proposals in favour of women. All the fine words have not been subsequently matched by fine deeds. However, enough of that.

I intend to devote the rest of my speaking time primarily to the substance of these proposals. We are nowadays constantly faced with the dilemma — which has now been brought out particularly clearly in the steel industry — that restructuring and automation mean fewer jobs and thus it is the people who suffer. The Commission's proposals to deal with the social conse-

**Dekker**

quences of this development show that this dilemma has been understood. The important thing now is to alleviate as far as possible the suffering caused and to create as much alternative employment as possible for younger people forced to leave the steel industry.

There are a number of comments I should like to make, in the margin as it were, on the Commission's measures and the motion for a resolution. The restructuring policy itself is aimed at restoring the competitive position of the European steel industry, particularly with regard to the United States and Japan, in order to make the industry viable and thus to preserve as many jobs as possible in this sector. We think it a good thing — and this applies in general terms — for economic restructuring measures to be coupled with measures designed to alleviate the social consequences. As regards the problems in the steel industry — which cry out for a European approach — this means that social measures must also be decided at European level.

One basic principle however, for all measures applied as part of a policy of restructuring — including social measures — is that they should not lead to increased structural costs, which would of course be contrary to the very aim of restructuring and would, in the final analysis, be against the interests of not only the employers but also the workers. The special measures the Commission is now proposing for the steel industry amount to an extension of the possibilities available under the terms of the Treaty. To be honest, it must be admitted that the European Treaties already discriminate in favour of workers in the steel and coal industries compared with those in other sectors. And now we have these proposals for further special support measures.

Let me clarify this remark, though, by adding that this in no way detracts from the need for social measures along these lines. Indeed, these measures should be seen as the start of an integrated Community social policy covering all sectors. Any such policy will have to go hand in hand with a Europe-oriented industrial policy and a sectoral structural policy, the need for which I stressed in the employment debate at the beginning of the year. The Peters Report too deplores the fact that it has still not been possible to develop a viable Community industrial policy.

A second important element in the steel industry is the regional problem. Early retirement enables people to remain in their home regions. The situation is different, though, as regards the introduction of an additional shift, whereby workers made redundant in areas where the industry is weak will be attracted to better placed firms not threatened with closure in other regions. By introducing an extra shift, these healthy firms will be able to take on additional workers. Of course, this means that workers will have to be prepared to move from one region to another. Another point is that the hardest-hit regions will be

those where steel is the sole major industry. In principle, we support the proposed measures, on the understanding that we see the introduction of an additional shift as a way of improving working conditions, particularly in the case of heavy work and irregular hours. In my amendment to paragraph 16, this point is brought out more clearly than it is in the motion for a resolution. Priority should also be given to cases of heavy work and irregular hours when making reductions in working time. As regards other types of work, a start can be made by allowing more flexibility in the number of hours worked.

The conclusions to the report refer only the possibility of reducing working time per week, per year, or over the entire working life. I am sorry not to find any mention of reducing daily working hours which is far more worthy of attention as a means of bringing about the desired redistribution of work between men and women. Given that the proposed measures should not be cost-inflationary, the inevitable economic consequences of these measures must be counter balanced by improved productivity and contributions from both employers and workers. This is the thinking behind my amendment to paragraph 15. In special cases such as we have here, governments can also be expected to play their part by means of a special transitional measures, on the understanding that the steel industry will be in a position to bear the full cost itself once restructuring has been completed. I should like to hear from the Commission whether it can confirm that such prospects do indeed exist.

The employers' reluctance to accept the proposed measures is claimed to be mainly because of the possible effects on their competitive position I wonder, though, whether they are really justified? Does the Commission see any such danger? How temporary could these measures be? How does the Commission see the future once these special support measures have run their course? And what will the position be as regards the rights acquired in the process?

My third amendment makes a slight change in paragraph 9, where the motion for a resolution, in the Dutch version at least, stresses that priority should be given to maintaining existing employment. To adopt this as an aim may be unnecessarily rigid and may itself jeopardize the position of firms in the sectors concerned. What we are in favour of is maintaining employment as far as possible, in existing sectors which means above all strengthening the industries concerned.

However, the creation of new jobs with good prospects for the future is at least as important as the preservation of existing ones. My amendment seeks to modify the original wording of the resolution accordingly, and on this point, I should like to put in a word for the much more intensive utilization of the so-called external conversion facilities provided for in Article 56(2a) of the ECSC Treaty. Clearly the crea-



**Dekker**

tion of new alternative jobs is the most fundamental solution.

Finally, in adopting these proposed measures it must be assumed that the restructuring process will actually be carried out and that the Commission will be able to place this scheme on a permanent footing. Let me conclude by thanking Mr Peters for his sound and enthusiastic work in drawing up this report.

**President.** — I call Mr Vetter.

**Mr Vetter.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the subject of this debate is of great importance for the workers in our countries in many respects. It is up to this House and the European Community to show that we are willing and able to carry out an industrial policy which is in the interests both of the workers and their families and of our industries' need to maintain and improve their competitive position.

The consequences of the economic crisis are being borne by workers in certain of Europe's traditional industries. Anyone who is *au fait* with the realities of present-day Europe will be aware of the links between the current crisis in certain industries and the regional crisis. It is time to draw certain conclusions from this tie-up. The industrial and regional crises affect all of us, whether or not we believe ourselves to be directly affected. Especially against the background of the now discernible economic downturn, it is simply not enough to express our concern in so many words, and I feel that the aggressive stance adopted by certain comrades and Members in this debate is not directed at the Member of the Commission but is rather an expression of frustration in the face of the impotence and deficiencies of that institution.

The iron and steel industry has been a source of concern to European industrial policy for decades now, and it is high time the social problems connected with the steel crisis were solved decisively, practically and in a way which respects the dignity of the people affected. Any such solution will require a concerted effort on the part of all the political groups in this House, especially those which are conscience of their responsibility for the workers. The result of such concerted action should not take the form of mere compromises and empty words. Well-meaning declarations may just about do to paper over the cracks, but they are not an effective means of allaying people's fears about the loss of their livelihood.

The motion for a resolution tabled by the Committee on Social Affairs and employment contains a number of points which can make an important contribution to genuinely improving the situation. I am thinking here in particular of the proposed steps to be taken towards reducing working time. The hoary old argument that a

reduction in working time would cost an enormous amount of money is as old as the history of industrial relations. In the light of modern economic science and economic policy, it is nothing more than a demagogic and false argument.

Mass unemployment as we now have in Europe is profoundly inhuman and its social costs are immensely higher than the likely cost of introducing shorter working hours. The financing of unemployment is also basically pointless and unproductive. The financing of a reduction in working time, on the other hand, is an effective means of improving living and working conditions, and I am thinking here in particular of the introduction of an additional shift and voluntary retirement from the age of 55. I deplore the fact that we only really start talking about reducing working time when jobs are threatened in certain industries. A reduction in working time is quite simply a logical consequence of technological developments. It should be applied across the board and is an element in the process of humanizing work.

All too often in the past, interesting and sometimes courageous proposals drawn up by the Commission have been substantially watered down by the national governments, in other words, the Council. Occasionally though, one cannot help but get the impression that the Commission just lacks the necessary courage. However, this latter comment does not apply to the subject we are discussing, today. In this case, the Commission has submitted a perfectly serviceable proposal which deserves to receive the support of a large majority of this House. Failure to come up with the necessary support will mean further curtailment of Europe's scope for action.

I also have a basic criticism to make of the proposed strategy in this case. Taken overall, the measures proposed are of an essentially defensive nature. In other words, we are more concerned with the symptoms of the disease than with its causes, and the fact is that there is simply no European industrial policy which can offer us solutions today to tomorrow's problems. I cannot help thinking, then, that the Community is simply adopting a deplorably passive attitude in sitting back and waiting for the industrial, economic and social problems connected with the enlargement of the Community to descend on it without devoting thought right now to developing a comprehensive policy to prepare for all the problems of enlargement. How otherwise could the — in principle — already settled enlargement of the Community have become a vote-catching tactic on the part of one of the governments which supported the principle of enlargement?

Let me conclude with a remark on a subject which is very dear to my heart. Let me remind you, ladies and gentlemen, that one element of a positive plan for Europe is the search for ways and means of enabling workers to participate on an equal basis in economic

**Vetter**

decision-making processes. Any solution to the crisis in the steel industry which is not based on the equal participation of workers will always be a bad solution. It is a fact that where workers have highly developed rights, the repercussions of the crisis are not as serious as they are in places where such rights are not fully developed or do not exist at all. I think it is significant that this report and this motion for a resolution achieved a wide measure of support in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. This motion for a resolution is the result of long and patient discussions. It is a compromise which falls short of what we would see as an optimum solution, but it is a serviceable compromise and I very much hope that it will achieve a wide measure of support.

We are told over and over again that we should proceed in the spirit of social partnership. I must say — now we are talking about crises — that we must first of all give the workers concerned proof of our intentions. Only then can we start talking about social partnership.

If we were to proceed thus, Mr President, we should have taken a small but significant step forwards towards a Community of European solidarity worthy of the workers' respect.

**President.** — I call Mr Nordlohne.

**Mr Nordlohne.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, let me preface my remarks by pointing out that the importance of this subject deserves more attention than the presence of a mere ten percent of all the Members of this House. That is not so much criticism as a statement of fact. As to the subject itself, let me begin by congratulating Mr Peters most warmly on behalf of the EPP Group for the exhaustive and definitive report he has given us on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. We had a debate in this House on an interim report on the Commission's communication in November 1979, and there is no need for me to go into that matter in any more detail. Let me just make the point that a hearing was held with representatives of the European employers' and workers' organizations under the auspices of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment on 31 March 1980, when we had a detailed discussion of this Report. The Committee approved the motion for a resolution at its meeting on 29 May 1980 by a vote of 13 to three with seven abstentions. As the Chairman of my group pointed out, requests for urgent procedure submitted since then by Members of the Socialist Group and individual Members — all of which were rejected by this House — were for propaganda purposes only and contributed nothing practical whatsoever to the discussion of the matter in hand.

I have a few comments to make on the situation in the steel industry. Mr Peters' report dealt with all the

problems in great detail, and to save time, I shall not go into the matter in any great depth. I should just like to make the important point that productive capacity in the Community was too great, so that capacity utilization in 1979 was only of the order of 69.8 %. In the European Community's steel industry, the number of jobs declined by an average of 14.2 % between 1974 and 1978, with important steelmaking regions being particularly hard hit. I am most grateful to Mr Peters for making this point in detail in his report. As a result of the decline in productive capacity, 39 200 jobs were lost in the Community in 1977, 36 500 in 1978 and a further 50 000 in 1979. The rapporteur rightly points out that we must expect sales to decline as a result of the higher price of oil, which is bound to make itself felt in the iron and steel industry. We now have a motion for a resolution along those lines.

As to the Commission's proposals, the revised draft of a Commission Decision of 20 July 1979 provides for a number of temporary new Community allowances for specified social measures under the restructuring plan for the steel industry. As Mr Peters told us, these allowances are earmarked to aid early retirement and the improvement of working conditions and working time — more specifically regarding short-time working, the reform of the shift system and a reduction in overtime.

The important thing is that these allowances should not affect the independence of the two sides of industry and should have a positive effect on jobs without — immediately or subsequently — jeopardizing the competitiveness of the firms concerned. This latter principle is the best guarantee for safeguarding jobs in the long-term and creating new ones. When Parliament debated Mr Peters' interim report, we were in full agreement on this point, and the same point was made emphatically at the hearing organized by the committee.

We support the Commission's amended draft decision of July 1979 insofar as it aims to utilize the existing possibilities provided for in Article 56 of the ECSC Treaty more intensively. I would not deny that we have reservations as to any measures going beyond this. The various opinions on the connected macro-economic problems have been expressed in such bodies as the Tripartite Conference's Standing Committee on employment questions, the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament.

These problems will not be eliminated simply by confining these planned measures to the steel industry. The reservations of my group may be summarized as follows.

Firstly, neither the list of measures nor the means of finance are confinable to the implementation of structural adaptation processes in the steel industry. The financing of such initiatives by the Commission is bound to have a substantial precedential effect, as the

## Nordlohne

Italian demand during the first discussions in the Council showed.

Secondly, the proposed measures take no account of the differing social systems in the Member States.

Thirdly, it seems unrealistic to limit the proposed social measures to three years and subsequently to revoke the new working conditions.

Fourthly, the measures place those firms which have already carried out the necessary changes at their own cost at a disadvantage.

Fifthly and finally, the proposed measures are bound to have an adverse effect in Member States with advanced social systems and with free collective bargaining and worker participation.

My group attaches great importance to the Community's policy in the steel industry, as it aims to safeguard the future of the European steel industry and thus to retain hundreds of thousands of jobs. From the outset my group has advocated the principle of a parallel social policy to assist the workers affected by restructuring.

Let me now move on to what Mr Van Minnen had to say. I do not know what meetings he attended, but I would advise him to read it all up in the records. The committee quite clearly followed the line I described just now ...

*(Interruption by Mr Van Minnen)*

... Yes, and the same goes for the Committee on Budgets, of which you are not a member. I can only say that the proposal to commit 30 million EUA at the initiative of Mr Schön, and I thank the Commission for supporting me on this point.

Getting back to what I was saying about the Peters report and the motion for a resolution, I should like to say that, despite the minor reservations my group has on the amended Commission draft, the EPP Group is prepared to support the report provided our amendments are adopted by a majority of this House and provided other amendments do not substantially detract from the merits of the resolution. We should like to see the major part of the motion for a resolution adopted in its present form, as I said to Mr Peters.

The central point of the motion for a resolution is not paragraph 15 but paragraph 10. We should like to see a minor amendment to the wording by the deletion of the word *unreservedly* in the first sentence and the insertion of a paragraph 10a, as set out in our Amendment No 35. We believe that the first half-sentence of paragraph 13 can be deleted on the grounds that otherwise the second half of the sentence would simply repeat the demand for a reduction in structural and short-term overtime. Our Amendment No 17

seeks to amend paragraph 17 by the addition of a call for the Community to give more assistance to vocational training, retraining and further training schemes and to strengthen the mobility of workers.

Our Amendments Nos 18 and 19 call for the deletion of paragraphs 21 and 22 of the motion for a resolution on the grounds that it is not up to this House to vote to condemn the activities of employers and expressly welcome the views of workers' organizations. We feel that it is purely a matter for the two sides of industry to decide what stands to adopt *vis-à-vis* the Commission's proposals. We cannot give our support to paragraph 15 of the motion for a resolution calling for a reduction of at least 10 % in total working time. We do not believe that a reduction in the working week is an appropriate means of combatting unemployment. On this point, our views are shared by the Council of Ministers for Social Affairs and Employment, which — at its meeting on 22 November 1979 — rejected *de facto* the Commission's proposal for the introduction of a policy of a coordinated reduction in working time throughout the Community, taking into account the views of the two sides of industry. Even the Commission has admitted that it can only hazard a forecast of the global and structural effects of a reduction in working time, which is why we should adopt a cautious and differentiated approach, taking into consideration the initial and competitive situations of the firms concerned as well as the availability and training of qualified workers. In our opinion, unemployment cannot be tackled by distributing the available work to more and more workers. A shortcoming cannot be eliminated by spreading the little that is available around as much as possible.

Bearing that in mind, we have tabled an amendment, for which we beg the House's support.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I see that I have used up exactly my allotted speaking time, and I should like to conclude my remarks by calling on a majority of this House to support this report. Our support will be forthcoming as long as the amendments we have discussed with Mr Peters are adopted by a majority of this House.

**President.** — I call Mr Prag.

**Mr Prag.** — Mr President, our views in this matter are based on the same concern for the steel industry as that of my colleagues opposite. But they are also based, as indeed our work in this Parliament should always be, on practicality and common sense. The slogans and high-flown sentiments of Mr Ansart will do nothing at all for the steel industry.

Now the real answer to the problem, as I see it, is, I am afraid, perhaps as far from possible achievement as the sentiments of Mr Ansart. I have said before in this

**Prag**

Chamber that what we really need is at least a tripling of the Community loan funds available for new industry and for the re-equipment of existing industry, a tripling of the ECSC reconversion loan funds, of the Ortolani facility and of the European Investment Bank loans for the encouragement of alternative industries — a real Community effort to face up to this recession which is spreading its way rapidly over our member countries. We do not hear much talk today of counter-cyclical investment but the need for it is as great as it ever was in the past. Reluctantly, we must face the fact that we do not have that possibility. We know that the Council of Ministers is not going to give us that tripling of investment funds — partly because of the attitude of Member States towards public expenditure that Commissioner Tugendhat referred to, partly because of the resistance of most industry to new investment during periods of low confidence.

To come then to the smaller field of the Peters report and the Peters recommendations, let me try to summarize our objections. First of all we object to the implication that you can stand still. We object to the implication in paragraph 9 of his report that priority should be given to maintaining existing employment. We believe that to be a fundamental error. It is the road to losing further markets, to a deterioration in competitiveness and, eventually to the bankruptcy of the industry. We believe that rapid change in the economy is the key to future high levels of employment, especially in the face of the upsurge of low-cost competition from other countries and particularly the richer, more advanced countries of the Third World. Rapid change, the adoption of new methods, of the latest techniques, of high technology, the regular changing of products really is the only answer in the long term.

The second thing we object to is the attempt to pretend; the idea that if you put your head down in the sand like an ostrich, the tiger advancing on you will disappear and the idea that if you cut working hours and employ more people it helps — it does not, it raises costs. Moreover, if you thereby increase production, what do you do with it? You have to find a market for that production. That steel must be sold. But the OECD market is contracting, not expanding and the world market, which is expanding slightly, is certainly not expanding fast enough to take our dearer steel. That, indeed, is the way to disaster and the result after the initial period would be an even less competitive steel industry producing less than before and with more unemployment — the exact opposite of what my friend, Mr Peters, wants.

The third thing we object to is the idea that these matters can be regulated by governments. Quite simply, colleagues, we cannot do it, we cannot decide that the Community should regulate what, we know, is in reality decided by the social partners in collective bargaining. It is nonsense to say that we can do such

things. And that is why, with some reluctance, we have come to the conclusion that the one thing the Community can do is to help in the matter of early retirement. And I hope the Community will be able to concentrate its efforts — its new efforts — in that field.

Now a quick word about the difficulties of financing and the Hoff report. There is a real problem of financing steel measures. There is no question of it. It is an absurdity that because the European Coal and Steel Community Treaty came first, the finance for coal and steel measures must come from the coal and steel industries themselves through the ECSC levy. Coal needs every penny that it can get for investment and to enable it to compete with imported coal, and the steel industry needs every penny it can get to keep itself alive. So there is, indeed a real problem. I would like to believe, Mr President, with Mrs Hoff, that there are no legal difficulties in the way of transfers from the EEC budget to the ECSC budget. That is clearly the only real solution: transfers from the general budget to that particular budget which was set up by treaty in 1952. Well, the Commission is convinced that there are legal difficulties; the Council also is convinced that there are legal difficulties, and the fact is that the Council holds the trump cards. That is why we have tabled an amendment to paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Hoff report. We believe that our amendment makes sense and in it we strongly urge the Council of Ministers to overcome any legal difficulties which exist. That is the way to get something out of the Council in this difficult matter. There is no doubt that if it wants to the Council can.

In conclusion I would say that the European Community began in 1952 in financial solidarity. We do well to recall how the prosperous Dutch and German mines, — there were Dutch mines in those days — financed the closure of and modernization programmes for the Belgian pits. The steel industry is surely a case where this notion of solidarity should be reasserted and where Community action in the form of a modest transfer of 100m EUA from the general EEC budget to the Coal and Steel Budget is sorely needed.

**President.** — I call Mr Petronio.

**Mr Petronio.** — (I) Mr President, the need for a thorough restructuring and conversion of the Community steel industry arises from the fact that diminished growth in consumption and changes in the balance between supply and demand throughout the world are increasing competition and forcing our manufacturers to improve their competitiveness. That means that the measures being taken vary in nature and scope according to the individual Member States and the individual steel companies, and the different programmes of restructuring and conversion must, where necessary, be assessed case by case.

**Petronio**

In our view the responsibility for the decision to restructure must, as is proper remain with the manufacturers, albeit within an operational framework established by the Community institutions. This framework comprises not only objective elements — such as existing capacity — but also subjective elements such as the estimates of future demand. It is a set of guidelines, but even so the Commission has been obliged to lay down a number of reference points, such as the criteria for financial support.

The changes in the steel industry are undoubtedly having a considerable effect on employment in some companies, and in some regions it may well become serious. We shall therefore have to do our utmost to ensure that all the provisions of the ECSC Treaty relating to redundant steelworkers are implemented to the full.

Considerable financial aid from public funds is essential, and the need for it was explicitly acknowledged by the Commission, who have said that a major programme of restructuring cannot be achieved by ECSC aid alone. We all accept this need, and in our view it is therefore important not so much to avoid giving aid from public funds as to avoid inequity and discrimination. Such aid has been with us for some years, and it is not clear to what extent it was authorized. For that reason we must at least keep to the principle of transparency — to give this support a sort of *nude look*. This will entail advance knowledge of the companies' development programmes and periodical ex-post-facto reporting by the Commission on what has been done.

Conversions already completed, in progress or decided upon conform with a Community plan only if they affect neither the balance between Member States nor the worldwide interests of the Community steel industry. Nor must they ignore the economic, social, market and structural equilibrium of each Member State, whilst remaining with the framework of harmonious development of the Community iron and steel industry.

The principle of not discriminating between manufacturers means, in particular equality of treatment, equality in the consideration of investment programmes, equality in financing those programmes, equality of treatment with social measures aimed at retraining and conversion, and equality in the granting of aid to Member States. All that, though still does not amount to unified Community action, and for that reason we feel we must emphasize that present trends should not be allowed to generate discord and discrimination on a Community scale.

**President.** — I call Mr Oehler.

**Mr Oehler.** — (F) Mr President, there are some positive aspects to the report tabled by our colleague

Johannes Peters on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. I would even go so far as to say that it represents real progress in relation to the other no less valuable initiatives taken by this Parliament. In particular, I thank the rapporteur for the amount of work done and for the faithfulness with which he reported on the work of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment.

Nonetheless I cannot approve this report and will explain why.

The measures proposed today by the Commission are very much in line with the measures contained in the Davignon plan, which we have always criticized and denounced. In our opinion the Davignon plan is not a plan for rescuing the French steel industry.

Instead of making way for modernization and genuine restructuring, the Davignon plan has greatly weakened the potential at least of the French steel industry. The employers have improved the liquidity position of the big groups by eliminating almost 13 000 jobs in less than a year in the heavy steel industry. But there has been no major new investment in modernization in exchange. All that has been done is to complete the construction of the oxygen steelworks at Neuves-Maisons and to extend that at Rehon, but nothing has been done to modernize the Longwy works, which is of major importance for the whole of the Lorraine steel-producing region. Yet that policy is the result of the application of the Davignon plan. And it is taking place at a time when restructuring should actually be directed towards increasing steel production, because according to the latest estimates, steel consumption will continue to increase up to the year 2 000. We very much fear that, as a result of the present policy, the French steel industry will be unable to cope when demand increases. Today, it is falling further behind whereas it should in fact be preparing for the future.

Once again the French Government and French employers bear a heavy responsibility in this sphere. Their policy and employers in the iron and steel industry has meant that it has stopped manufacturing long products. However, demand for these products on the world market may increase in future years, whereas as a result of the — foreseeable — difficulties of the motor industry it is to be feared that there will be serious difficulties in finding outlets for flat products.

At the same time, we are still waiting for the social measures which should have been implemented immediately. A few factories producing parts for the motor industry will not resolve the grave employment problems of the French steel-producing regions.

The lack of proper reconversion is as serious as the problem of working conditions in the steel industry.

The whole policy of employers, which is geared to encouraging voluntary retirement and to official

**Oehler**

redundancies, has led to the following state of affairs: firstly, it is primarily young people who have left the steelworks; secondly, these departures mean that many production units are below strength, which affects working conditions adversely; thirdly, steelworkers' wages no longer keep pace with the rise in the cost of living; fourthly, what is more, temporary workers are being used while more than 13 000 jobs have been lost and when, in fact, in all sectors, instead of being dismissed, more labour should be taken on.

All these remarks should be added to the — often sensible — conclusions of the Peters report. But as I have just explained, it is the whole Davignon plan and its consequences that we denounce and condemn.

In conclusion, I should like to draw your attention of the whole House to the following fact: in my opinion every effort was made in France and even in Parliament to obstruct the work of the rapporteur. As an example, let me just mention the incomprehensible and unacceptable measures to which the rapporteur was subjected when he wanted to meet French steelworkers, in order to broaden his knowledge of the case. A spurious campaign was launched against him by Lorraine's Communist representatives, to which, I regret to say the French government was a party. But above all I deplore the fact that our President should have seen fit to yield to this pressure.

**IN THE CHAIR: MR JAQUET***Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Schön.

**Mr Konrad Schön.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, following on from what my colleague Mr Nordlohne from the EPP Group had to say, I should like to address a few remarks to Mr Van Minnen, who felt obliged to attack the Christian Democrats in his speech.

Firstly, as a representative of my Group in the Committee on Budgets, I have always supported the measures discussed in the Hoff report, to which I should merely like to add that, following lengthy discussions, my group came to the conclusion that paragraph 4 was sufficient to draw attention to the fact that the expenditure concerned was of a non-compulsory nature, so that this House — as one arm of the budgetary authority — will always be able to keep an eye on the implementation of the measures, and that these measures will be kept under supervision by all of us in the spirit of the Hoff report. As a result, my group feels that paragraph 5 of the Hoff report can be dispensed with. That is just by the by, Mr Van Minnen, as you appear to be suffering from a lack of

information. When you attacked the Member of the Commission, the Commission itself and the Christian Democrats, you evidently were not aware that the stiffest resistance to the Commission's proposals came from the Federal German Government, which is led by Social Democrats, and from the Social Democrats in the German Bundestag, who unanimously rejected what we are discussing here to day.

Secondly, I believe that the social problems of the steel industry can only be solved in a macroeconomic context. I believe that the best social policy for the steel industry would be for all of us to do everything in our power to restore the international competitiveness of European steelworks. However, I do not think competitiveness can be restored by introducing a fifth shift at short notice, by calling for a 35-hour week and by doing away with voluntary overtime and to call for this whole package to be applied over the whole Community. Speaking as a neighbour from the Saarland of the previous speaker who comes from Lorraine, I can tell you that there are firms — for instance, in the Saarland — which have carried out restructuring operations very quickly and intensely, and not least in the wake of the Davignon Plan, with national aid of course — I admit — and where workers have of course been made redundant but have then been integrated in the plan to create new jobs. We now have a situation where there is a lack of even highly-qualified and well-paid skilled workers — in other words, where hundreds of jobs are available. I would counsel the leader of the German Trade Union Federation, Mr Vetter, to reject the idea — as Mr Nordlohne said — that spreading short comings around can ever be effective alternative to policies designed to restore the productivity of the steel industry.

The reason why, despite all this, I shall be going along with the majority of my group in supporting these social measures is because I do not want to see the necessary restructuring, which will have to be even more drastic in view of the crises we shall be facing in the coming years, carried out at the expense of workers in the steel industry. That is why I shall be voting in favour of the classic social measures set out in the ECSC Treaty. But if it is intended to introduce new measures in addition to these traditional ones, I would ask that, when we come to discuss the steel industry again in connection with a report from the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, these short-term social measures should be viewed in a macroeconomic context as part of a macroeconomic analysis of restructuring measures in the steel industry. With this proviso, I shall always support anything which is intended to have a short-term alleviating effect, but I would warn you against succumbing to the superficial idea that a reduction in working time will in itself produce more jobs. If, ladies and gentlemen, you add still further to the already high costs caused by higher bills for wages and energy — which are, after all, key costs in any industry — you will in fact succeed only

**Schön**

in eliminating even more jobs. I would therefore ask you to support the amendments discussed by Mr Nordlohne and incorporate them into the report drawn up on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. The Committee on Budgets supports the Report in the hope of finding as broad a majority as possible to enable the Commission as quickly as possible to render help where it is needed. I would, however, also ask you to view this matter in a wider perspective, as part of the macroeconomic trend in the European Community, so that the Community does not drift apart as the situation worsens, with every region and every Member State succumbing to the twin diseases of subventionitis and protectionism and thus undermining the Common Market and any attempt at a common European policy. That is my big worry, and the social policy and economic policy experts as well as the two sides of industry should do everything in their power to develop a genuinely European industrial policy based on the problems of the steel industry. Then I think we shall be on the right road.

**President.** — I call Mr Price.

**Mr Price.** — Mr President, I was born and have lived most of my life in South Wales, which is an area that is going to be particularly affected by the measures that are now taking place in the steel industry. The economy of that particular area over the years has been based on the twin pillars of the coal and steel industries. We have seen over a number of years a loss of employment in the coal industry and now we are seeing over a much shorter period the loss of employment in the steel industry. Now, faced with these dramatic changes, one could take one of two attitudes. One that is taken by some is that of the ostrich, to try and bury their heads in the sand and pretend that jobs which are no longer required still exist and I believe that that policy is one which is an insult to the people of an area like South Wales who have a proud industrial history and are first-class workers. It is to say that they are from now on in that industry to pretend that work exists which no longer does exist for them. They cannot continue to produce the same output of steel because otherwise it would simply stockpile. Therefore, if you keep them in those jobs, what will happen is simply that they will go to work and pretend to make steel, instead of carrying on the job that they have over the years. I therefore reject that ostrich policy. I believe that what we need in areas like that is a far more realistic policy and, in the main, I think that this report contains such a view. It recognizes that there is going to be a loss of employment and tries to minimize the human cost of what is going to happen. But I believe that this report really only tells part of the story. It looks at the slimming down in the steel industry itself and tries to help the workers who are leaving that industry. But this Community, I believe, has got to do a lot more in its other sectors, in its policies

relating to the Regional Fund and to the Social Fund, to try to help areas of this kind, because the changes which are now going to affect those areas are massive and I believe that the Community should be both realistic and, at the same time, strong to try and help those areas by looking upon the problem as a Community problem facing us all.

**President.** — I call Mr Barbi.

**Mr Barbi.** — *(I)* Mr President, I must apologize to the rapporteur and to the Commissioner: in the general chorus of approval for these measures mine is one voice of disapproval. As I had occasion to point out in the Committee on Budgets when we were discussing our opinion on these proposals, I am not in favour of this report and its proposal for dealing with the steel industry crisis and its social effects, deplorable though they undoubtedly are, by means of a series of Community measures in addition to those provided for in the ECSC Treaty. I am not in favour because the measures which are being proposed maintain workplaces will undoubtedly upset the Community's policy of harmonious development of the economy of the nine Member States in the absence of a common industrial policy, the proposed measures would in particular it is clear that further worsen the imbalance between the wide range of Community action devoted to steel and the little devoted to all the other Community industries — little more than job-training out of the Social Fund — industries some of which are in as deep a crisis as steel, such as shipbuilding, textiles and chemicals, I therefore feel that the Community should draw up and implement a wide-ranging, properly financed, common policy which provides for the restructuring, and especially for the conversion required not only by the occasional cyclical crisis but by the general redeployment of the international labour market which is the consequence of decolonization and the development of the emerging countries.

A second reason for opposing the proposals, is that these measures are in addition to those already provided for by the ECSC Treaty, which benefits firms concentrated largely in the most highly-developed areas of Europe; these measures provide for compensation not only for short-time working but even for loss of overtime, whilst no form of Community aid exists to maintain the income of unemployed workers in any other industry, not even in areas of the Community which are at a far greater economic disadvantage and where it is far more difficult find jobs in other industries. That is a strident, discordant contrast to the harmonious development which is being proposed, a contrast to the policy of economic convergence and a contrast to the — alas — all too modest attempts — modest in means and in achievement — at a regional policy. I find it quite incredible that on one hand, the Community is proposing to

**Barbi**

provide new funds to keep alive businesses which put off for too long the restructuring they needed, working old — obsolete — machinery to its technical and economic limits, in areas where industrial development and the standard of living are most advanced, whilst on the other hand it is skimping on funds for development in less favoured areas, and has neither the political will nor the economic means to set up the new common policy, particularly for reconversion in the industrial crisis areas, which would make a decisive contribution to a general improvement in industrial production, and hence in steel consumption, and thus to a genuine, worthwhile, economically valid solution to the steel crisis itself.

However, Mr President, I also have a third reason for my opposition to this report. It provides for financial support for a reduction in the working week in the steel industry. That idea has disturbing implications in my view, not because I am opposed to the principle of a reduction in the working week, but because a reduction of this kind cannot be introduced as part of a plan to cope with an economic crisis in just one industry. Such a plan would upset the economic and social life of the entire industrial sector, entailing a series of increases in the cost of labour which would in turn again give industry problems of international competitiveness. The reduction of working time is a very important question which must be researched, tried out and put into practice in an overall coordinated programme, and the direction of that programme cannot and must not be dictated by the tactics which certain Italian trade unionists used to refer to as 'the pioneer corps'. Such tactics may be perfectly acceptable to those whose intention is to overthrow — or even merely to destabilize — our social and economic way of life, but not to those who are proposing harmonious, balanced and progressive development. I am in favour of a systematic reduction of working time, but for that we need a wide-ranging Community industrial policy, carefully thought-out and courageously implemented. To support such a major policy of industrial conversion in the social domain we shall need to use the Social Fund, need to use it wisely and generously, and of course we shall need sufficient resources to implement such a policy and to finance the Social Fund much more generously.

Thus we come to the usual *ceterum censeo*: of course we need greater financial resources than those hinted at in Mr Tugendhat's statement here today on the 1981 budget. We must tell the Council of Ministers clearly and firmly that until we break through the one-percent-of-VAT barrier, until we can guarantee the Community adequate own resources, there will never be any real industrial conversion policy such as the present steel crisis is crying out for; neither will there ever be a policy for harmonious development and economic convergence in Europe; we will never get away from the small-time trading policy of which these measures are again typical; we shall never get away from the stop-gap policies which, above all,

leave the rich richer and the poor poorer. That may be all very well for those who think of Europe as a way of retaining the status quo, but not for those who think of Europe as a way of achieving progress and justice, unity and liberty. That is the way I think, and that is why I am against the proposals.

**President.** — I call Mr Boyes.

**Mr Boyes.** — Let me start by congratulating Mr Peters on the quality of the report that he has produced for us to debate today and expressing my appreciation of the considerable amount of work that has gone into the production of that report. Let me also particularly emphasize my support for those extra measures which are mentioned in his report in paragraphs 10 and 15, particularly early retirement, improvements in conditions and duration of work, changes to shift work, but above all, Mr President, that there should be a significant reduction in the amount of work done by each worker. He goes on to say that this should be at least 10 % of working time without loss of salary, to be achieved in the next 5 years. Those parts of Mr Peters' motion for a resolution are, in my view, vitally important.

Let me say something to make it clear what I am not in favour of. I am against Davignon's purely capitalistic restructuring of the steel industry, which uses the same old capitalist values of profiteering and racketeering, which has led to exactly the same kind of redundancies on a scale ...

**President.** — Mr Boyes, would you allow Mr Davignon to speak for a moment?

**Mr Boyes.** — ... I will give way. I do not mind listening to him.

**Mr Davignon.** — Mr President, this is a personal statement. Mr Boyes has made some remarks and it is not clear whether he was referring to capitalists in general or to those in the Commission with responsibility for policy. If the former is the case, his remarks are of a general nature. In the latter case, it is up to the Chair to decide whether these words constitute parliamentary language permissible in this Chamber.

**President.** — Would you clarify your remarks, Mr Boyes?

**Mr Boyes.** — I am talking about capitalists in general, and, as far as I am concerned, they are profi-



## Boyes

teers and racketeers. I am not withdrawing that phrase in any way unless the President says it is unacceptable in this forum. But it is used in a lot more areas besides this one.

I call it that because of the scale of the redundancies that these plans have led to. Hundreds of thousands of jobs have been lost in the steel industry and we are only just today talking about cash for the social effects of them. It is absolutely ridiculous and I do not give a damn what Davignon thinks, because that is what has happened as a result of these plans of his. I am for reorganization and for some protection within the steel industry — it was necessary — but not the destruction on the scale that we have seen in the last few years. What I want to question too, as I did on Monday, is whether the assumptions on which that plan was based are correct or not. Let me not rely on the words of Roland Boyes, but, instead, quote one or two people who may have a little more stature. What is it Stimpson, the Chairman of National Steel (USA), says at the moment? He says quite clearly that there is a good possibility of a world steel shortage beginning in 1985 and growing thereafter. What does Roesch, the President of US Steel say? He says:

There is growing evidence that steel producers around the world are not expanding their capacity fast enough to keep up with the expected sustained growth in demand over the next few years. The current world over-capacity is rapidly dissolving.

That is what those people say. In the ISDC's new document, 'New Deal for Steel', they spell out quite clearly that the demand for steel has been increasing continuously over the last 3 years. And what are we seeing, especially in the UK? 70 000 jobs lost already, another 52 000 jobs to disappear and a new BSC chairman who says there must be even more redundancies. That is the net result of this kind of plan without the necessary social measures. What you call restructuring means to the workers redundancies and, as one of the previous speakers said, if you want a Europe, we want a Europe for the workers as well as for the bosses. We want a Europe that looks after the working people as well as the multinationals. And having said that, I do not know if you have seen yesterday's *Times*, but it seems to me that the bosses are not happy at the moment. 'EEC steel policy falls into disarray' says the headline in *The Times*, not, as my Conservative colleagues know, exactly one of the Left-wing journals. 'Companies break ranks over Davignon's anti-crisis production guidelines' — and Davignon himself is reported as saying in Munich last week — and if Mr Davignon denies he said it, I will accept it this time as I am reading from a newspaper — that an overwhelming majority of European steel producers were exceeding the voluntary production limits on which the plan was based. Maybe you did, maybe you did not say that, Mr Davignon, but as far as I am concerned, there has got to be an end to your plan, or the plans of the Commission, leading to redundancies on the scale on which they are occurring

at the moment, because you know, as well as I do, that it takes time and cash to produce jobs and we are not being given either the time or the money, certainly not by the Commission. You, yourself, said in an article, Viscount Davignon, that there can be no question of the Commission abandoning those involved. I do not know what you are offering the 70 000 or so steelworkers, or ex-steelworkers as they will soon be, in Britain. I do not know whether you think they have been abandoned or not. Since Europe is about people, it is about workers as well. The EEC is not an abstract, unsympathetic organization, for, in a speech in Parliament, you said it costs at least 30 000 European units of account to create a new job. Is that not correct? — I am reading from an extract from one of your speeches. However, this would mean an investment of 33 000 million for 100 000 jobs, an impossible figure for the EEC, even if it had to contribute only a nominal percentage. So what you are saying is yes, the plans do lead to redundancies but on the other hand we cannot do anything to help you to solve the problems. Is that not what you are saying? I know what the workers at Consett are saying. We had 1 000 people on the march yesterday in London from Consett, a march to the Commons.

And I would remind Mrs Kellett-Bowman, before she starts shouting out, that it is not in here that we were facing the problem yesterday. Not one Conservative Member of Parliament would meet one of the thousand steelworkers who marched across London. So when Mr Prag says 'we're concerned about the steelworkers', when Miss Forster says, as she did this morning, 'We're concerned about the steelworkers', you may be talking about Mr Prag and Miss Forster but you are certainly not talking about the Conservative Government in Britain — when, in the central lobby of the Houses of Parliament, not one Conservative could be bothered getting off his backside to meet a steelworker. Is that the kind of government we have got in Britain?

Because the case for the Consett steelworkers is unquestionable, not only on profit-making grounds — but I do not want to argue the capitalist case — but also on social grounds. What do you people over there say about 35 % unemployment minimum? What do you have to say about that? What have you got to say about 4 000 men without any prospect of work? And what about the kids of those men without any prospect of work? Consett is an industrial town in an area of already high unemployment. Do you know what the slogan was: 'We sell steel not jobs'. Those men are pleading and they look to the EEC. They look to the Commission and its social measures, saying: create us some jobs with this money — do not just throw us on the scrapheap, do not just leave us without any work. We want to work and we think we have the right to work. So where are the Commission's proposals to project jobs? That is what we want. And if in your reorganization plans it is necessary to lose some jobs in steel, we want those men who are to be made

**Boyes**

redundant to work in those steelworks until alternative jobs have been created for them. The men in Britain will not accept — the workers in the steel industry will not accept — the kind of false analysis that the Commission is putting forward. It is totally irrelevant to the steelworkers of Consett and their families if the Commission says we will give you a little bit more money on top of your redundancy pay from the EEC. That is no good to them, they want real opportunities to work, real opportunities to earn a living for their families and they want to think that when their 16-year old kid leaves school he is going to have a job to go to.

So what we are saying is, yes, Hans Peters is exactly right in this report when he calls for those measures to be supported by the Commission that will ensure that there is a sharing out of jobs, ensure that jobs are there and stay there. We welcome the idea of early retirement but not if it means that vacancies thus created can never be refilled. We want the man at 50 or 55 to be able to say: 'I have done my whack in a stinking, terrible steelworks'. But we also want him to be able to say: when I go there is a job for my son, for somebody else's son, for the youth of Consett, for the youth of France, for the youth of Belgium or of wherever there are steelworks. There are 7 million unemployed in Europe — 1.5 million rising to 2 million in Britain. Too little, too late! That is my comment on the Commission's proposals at the moment. I shall support Hans Peters' report. I shall vote for his report. I will vote for 30 million units of account because, although it is a pittance, we want as much money to be made available for the steel industry as possible. We want as much money as possible to offset those terrible measures that are being taken as a result of the so-called anti-crisis plan. The anti-crisis plan has led to one thing, as far as I am concerned. It has led to at least 70 000 steelworkers in Britain being out of work. It is not anti-crisis, it has created in the steel industry the biggest crisis that we have ever had. That is what it has resulted in Britain. So my plea is to everybody to support those aspects of this report that allow for worksharing, those aspects of this report that allow people to work shorter hours and provide for extra shift work and special improvements in the conditions and the duration of works. That is what we want to see and we will welcome the money for that. But if there are any further redundancies then people who bring forward measures that lead to redundancies will be responsible for the reactions of the communities when the men and the kids in those communities cannot get any work. I support Mr Peters' resolution.

**President.** — I call Mr Simpson.

**Mr Simpson.** — Unlike the previous speaker I do not need to resort to unnecessary abuse to bolster my case. It is not a tradition in the British Parliament and I trust it is not going to become one in this House. The matter is far too serious for that.

The European steel industry is today in a state of crisis and, in the United Kingdom in particular is undergoing a period of rationalization involving a loss of many thousands of jobs. Since this rationalization is taking place within the framework of a European Community policy, it is entirely right that the Community should make the maximum possible financial contribution towards alleviating the social effects of this policy in terms of unemployment and the need for retraining. In my own constituency the basic steelworks in Corby has recently been closed, involving the loss of 5 500 jobs out of a total workforce in town of 27 000. Already the level of unemployment is 12 % and it is going to run very much higher as the year goes on, as more workers are laid off. It is clear to me that the whole apparatus of Community funds — the Regional Fund to help develop new infrastructure, the Social Fund for training purposes, particularly for young people, as well as the resources of the European Investment Bank and the Coal and Steel Community funds under the Treaty, is more and more necessary. The steel industry is generally the staple, if not the sole, industry in the area and it is therefore particularly serious when a closure is carried out. In those areas which are hit by closures the emphasis must be to attract new industries and new jobs in order to rebuild the local community, to give it hope for the future and by judicious financial aid to re-establish a viable industrial base for the future. I agree with Mr Boyes when he says that we can never have enough money to help areas affected by steel closures, by redundancies, but that which we are asking for and that which is being offered is very welcome. And subject to the amendments moved by my own Group I welcome the motions both of Mr Peters and Mrs Hoff and I urge the House to support them. Now that the 1980 budget has been passed, I call upon the Council to provide immediate help to those areas which are most affected by steel closures and by reorganization.

**President.** — I call Mr Seal.

**Mr Seal.** — Mr President, this debate is really in two parts. It is a debate on the Peters Report but also the Parliament has decided to take with this an Oral Question with debate. Whilst I certainly agree with a lot of the comments that my colleagues in the Socialist Group have made, I want to speak on a slightly different matter, which concerns this Oral Question with debate.

First of all, Mr President, I would like to give Parliament a little background information on why I have actually put this question down on behalf of the Socialist Group and the Committee on External Economic Relations. On 25 March this year, the US Steel Company and seven other major firms in the USA took action to start anti-dumping procedures against the majority of the Community producers. Now all the firms except US Steel have dropped these

## Seal

proceedings. But unless US Steel drops them also, the American anti-dumping procedures, which are quite strict, will come into effect. This means that even though the anti-dumping case will probably be eventually lost by US Steel, in the meantime exports of steel to the USA will drop dramatically because of fears of any retrospective action that would be taken if in fact by any chance this case were won. We have heard from many speakers here today that the Community's steel industry is in a very serious position. It has been reported, as Mr Boyes said, that the plans for the steel industry are on the point of collapse. So we cannot afford to have another five million tonnes of surplus steel in the Community because of the loss of the market in the USA for these five million tonnes of steel — which is a possibility if this case is continued with.

Now I would like to make it clear to the House that the Community's steel producers are, in fact, honouring the 1977 OECD agreements. The Community is in this case complying with the GATT anti-dumping code. US Steel have not got a case. Those concerned know they have not got a case. They have taken, in my opinion, a political decision in pressing these anti-dumping procedures, because US Steel is at the moment a very out-dated steel-producing plant when compared with some of the European plants. They know that the US Administration is facing a very difficult election and is vulnerable. I feel that US Steel must be hoping that it will in some way be bought off by a worried Carter administration. I understand that Mr Jenkins at the Venice summit, raised this problem with Mr Carter and that the President of the USA is to examine the situation. Well, if he is going to examine the situation any pressure that we can exert from this House may help — and it is wonderful how pressure does help — to clarify his mind on this particular point. The Commission is in continuous contact with the USA. But in order to help the Commission put pressure on the USA Government to bring the US Steel Company into line, this House must give full support in this case to the Commission. We all know that Americans are very tough customers to negotiate with. The action of US Steel in my opinion was in any case in part a retaliation against the EEC decision on man made fibres. Obviously, we do not want direct confrontation with the USA but we must make it clear that the European Community is not an easy option for the USA, that it is also tough when it comes to negotiating trade agreements. If the American Government is in any way through this action to infringe the GATT provisions, then we in the Community must retaliate *immediately* with all possible counter measures.

I would like Parliament to support the request to wind up the debate on this Oral Question when it comes to voting tomorrow. I know there is division in the House in the Peters report, particularly amendments to the Peters report, but I hope there will be no division at all in supporting this resolution. This will give

Mr Davignon a little more ammunition for the battle with the US Administration. Although I appreciate that he must keep his options open in these negotiations, I hope he will certainly give a high priority to increasing the basic steel reference price, because this would not only help the USA, but it would also certainly help a lot of Members States' steel producers. I also feel that he ought to consider planned trade in steel with the USA. I feel this is desirable, not just for the Community but also for the USA and if the Commission could reach an agreed voluntary code of imports to the USA, then I am sure that all would benefit. But whatever happens, Mr President, I feel that we have got to be positive with this resolution. We must as a parliament be supportive of the Commission in its negotiations.

I certainly wish the Commissioner luck with his negotiations, because I am sure, particularly after listening to some of the speakers today, that he will be ever mindful of the tens of thousands of steel workers whose jobs are still dependent on his efforts with the USA.

**President.** — I call Mr Friedrich.

**Mr Ingo Friedrich.** — (D) Mr President, there can be no doubt that full employment is an indispensable aim of the social market economy and of our joint economic policy in Europe. On the other hand, our economy as a whole can only remain competitive in the long run on the basis of constant structural change, with the available labour moving as required to the better, more productive jobs. I therefore very definitely oppose the proposal embodied in the Peters Report for negotiating a reduction of 'at least 10 % of total working time without loss of salary'. This demand runs counter to any prospect of improving productivity and can only make our European companies even less competitive than they already are on world markets.

Ladies and gentlemen, latest analyses show that the average Japanese worker already works a month more a year than his counterpart in the Federal Republic of Germany. If this trend continues, one can already see the problems in the steel industry being repeated in the automobile and mechanical engineering industries, and — as we all know — protectionism is no answer here. Reductions in working time can only be justified economically if they are compensated for by improved productivity.

Let me give you an example. Several decades ago, when the blacksmith's trade was in difficulties due to the horse being replaced by machines in agriculture and elsewhere, reducing working hours in the smithy would have been equally pointless as a way of solving the problem. In fact, the only real salvation was in adapting to technical progress, changing over to repair

**Friedrich**

workshops and retraining the young blacksmiths. The situation is the same today, in that the small amount of money available would be better used to create new, more productive, jobs in other sectors and to retrain redundant young steelworkers in new skills, allowing the older workers to enjoy early retirement with a reasonable pension to protect their standard of living.

Ladies and gentlemen, this House should make it clear right from the outset that there is a majority in favour of using instruments of economic policy whenever shortages occur — and in this case, it is jobs which are in short supply — which means not simply ensuring an even distribution of the available work, but tackling the shortage of jobs at its roots. If we carry on simply redistributing and redistributing, we shall soon have nothing left to redistribute, because the cake is getting smaller all the time, which means that the pieces cut out of it are bound to get smaller too. The redistribution alternative envisaged in the Peters proposal is not only fatalistic — it would also set in motion an unstoppable downward spiral.

Having referred earlier to the problems once faced by the blacksmiths, let me conclude by citing the example of the greatly increased unemployment which faced woodcutters in France in the last century. One of the solutions advanced at the time — in all seriousness — by a professor of economics was to issue the woodcutters with blunt axes. They would then fell substantially fewer trees than before over the same period of time, which would enable a larger number of woodcutters to be employed.

Ladies and gentlemen, I think those in authority at the time who refused to carry out the 'blunt axes' scheme had the right idea. By the same token, I support those now in authority who favour structural change instead of reductions in working time, this leading to a general reduction in unemployment by way of improved competitiveness.

I should like to congratulate the Council of Ministers — who deservedly get their full share of criticism in this House — on withstanding up to now the Commission's siren calls and refusing to make funds available for these anti-productivity measures in the European steel industry.

I hope, ladies and gentlemen, that this House will adopt the same attitude, and that there will be a majority against this proposal. It is our duty to do so in the interests of the long-term development of European industry.

**President.** — I call Mr Abens.

**Mr Abens.** — (F) Mr President, I would like to take the opportunity afforded me by the debate on the excellent report of our colleague and friend, Hans

Peters, to describe to you the particularly grave situation of the iron and steel industry in the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg. The fruit of long-standing industrialization based on the low grade ore of the Lorraine plateau, this industry since it cannot have recourse to cheap means of transport, is confronted with particularly severe problems in improving its competitiveness. Restructuring is proving a particularly delicate and difficult operation. To cope with the crisis which badly affected the Luxembourg steel industry in 1974, a restructuring plan was implemented which was the outcome of a tripartite agreement between the Socialist-led government, the trade unions and the employers. This plan made it possible to alleviate very considerably the social consequences of restructuring and likewise to lessen the shock of structural unemployment, with the result that the Grand Duchy remains by far the country least affected by unemployment in the Community. However, this effort is particularly difficult in the case of my country. On the one hand, the steel industry still represents about 15 % of the active population and of the Gross National Product and, on the other hand, the economic resources of the country are extremely limited compared with those of the big steel producing countries of the Community. For the Luxembourg budget, restructuring is a very heavy burden, firstly because of the payment of compensation for early retirement, and secondly because of the loss of fiscal revenue from the steel industry. This means that the resources provided out of national funds to assist of steelworkers are proportionally very limited.

It means also that Luxembourg, which has supported the Community restructuring plan on a regular basis since 1977, must be able to count on that *de facto* solidarity within the Community of which that great European, Robert Schuman, spoke and which is considered as the basis of European integration. Mr President, in view of this fact and of the proportionately greater seriousness of the crisis for my country, I think that the Community institutions should give special backing to the efforts of the Luxembourg authorities, trade unions and employers, particularly in the social sphere, where — and like the rapporteur I regret this — the Community has not been as energetic and effective as in the industrial aspects of restructuring.

On this note, Mr President, I will conclude and hope that the aggravation of the present crisis which is becoming more and more apparent and which has already resulted in the halting of restructuring within the Luxembourg steel industry, will prompt the European Parliament, the Commission and the Council to provide more effective support for efforts to lighten the burden of thousands of workers in my country.

**President.** — I call Sir John Stewart-Clark.

**Sir John Stewart-Clark.** — I want to say very simply that in my Group we support very strongly this motion

**Stewart-Clark**

regarding US Steel and the Community. It is absolutely indefensible that proper procedures should not be followed. I think that it is quite true that in a time of recession such as one finds today, both in Europe and in the United States, it is natural that certain protectionist policies should be followed. Nonetheless, my group and I feel that this Parliament should support the Commission totally in its attempts to find an amicable settlement, but in the absence of such an amicable settlement, then we must certainly take counter-measures. We believe in free trade, but we believe in free trade only when we get and see reciprocal treatment. If I may say to the Commissioner on my left, if he could take this as our support for his measures in this regard, he will have our Group and, I hope, this Parliament fully behind him.

**President.** — I call Mr Vredeling.

**Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (NL) Mr President, at the end of this long debate on what this House has rightly regarded as an important subject — the Commission's proposed social measures for the steel industry — I shall confine myself to replying to comments on this specific question. Other Members of the Commission will be dealing with the other aspects.

In such an important debate as this, we must of course be aware of the background, which I should like to go over very quickly.

There are something like 650 000 jobs in the Community's steel industry. Over the last three years — 1977, 1978 and 1979 — 75 000 jobs have been lost in this sector, and in the first three months of 1980 we have lost an estimated 17 200 more jobs — 5 600 of them in France, 2 100 in the Federal Republic of Germany and 9 400 in the United Kingdom. We expect a further 80 000 to 90 000 jobs to be lost between 1980 and 1983 — between 12 and 15 000 of them in France and 10 000 in the Federal Republic of Germany. In his report Mr Peters even gave a figure of 20 000 for the Federal Republic of Germany, including 5 000 in the Saarland, 4 000 in the Ruhr — notably Hoesch — 2 000 in Salzgitter and so on. The situation in the United Kingdom is not entirely clear. Last year there was talk provisionally of a gradual loss of 52 000 jobs in all, and no increase in this figure has been mentioned since.

2 000 jobs are expected to be lost in the Belgian steel industry in 1980, at least according to the information at our disposal. That is the background to this debate on social measures. Let me make the point right at the outset that blame for the loss of these jobs cannot be laid at the door of capitalism or socialism or anything like that. Their loss can simply be put down to two factors: rationalization within the industry and the downturn in economic activity resulting from the

world recession. There seems to me to be no point whatsoever in trying to score cheap points by trying to pin the blame on this or that political group. It is an indisputable fact that all governments — of no matter what persuasion — have problems to contend with, even in a country like the Federal Republic of Germany. This phenomenon of the loss of jobs is inherent in any industrialized society which has reached the level of development we enjoy in Western Europe. The situation is no different in countries like Sweden and Norway. That is the context in which we must view our proposed measures. There is one point I want to stress, and here I must say that I am personally very disappointed at the behaviour of the European Parliament. We managed to include in the budget the 30 million EUA, which the Council then struck off. Parliament reinstated this sum, and we accepted this. And while I think of it, this can be combined with a few words for the benefit of Mr Van Minnen.

We accepted Parliament's proposal, which was by no means an easy matter. After all, the Commission does not function in the same way as a government. My colleague Mr Tugendhat has an unenviable task indeed. He is a kind of Finance Minister, and I was myself once a Cabinet Minister in the Netherlands, where another member of my own party was the Minister of Finance, and he too was not exactly enthusiastic when I had to spend more on defence. That is perfectly natural. There always has to be a system of checks and balances, and there is no point in uttering howls of protest — you simply have to look at the results and judge accordingly. Up to the very last moment, we maintained 30 million EUA, until the Committee on Budgets finally turned it into a token entry.

The Committee on Budgets is chaired by Mr Lange, who is a member of the Socialist Group, and the committee's rapporteur, Mr Dankert, likewise belongs to the Socialist Group.

The Committee on Budgets made this a token entry, which meant in effect that it threw out these 30 million EUA!

That threw a major spanner in the works with regard to the Commission's plans for the steel industry. Of course, everyone will tell me about the mitigating circumstances which made that step necessary, and I appreciate that: the budget had to be passed. But that does not alter the fact that you — as the directly-elected European Parliament — are responsible for the form in which the 1980 budget has been adopted.

The fact is that you felt you had to cave in under pressure from the Council. That is not in itself reprehensible — after all, life is like that. But it must be made clear where the responsibilities lie.

Incidentally, there appears to be a misunderstanding here which ought to be dispelled. You have made things difficult for yourselves — although I sympath-

### Vredeling

ize from the political point of view — by referring in the motion and in the amendments to a reduction in working time. That is something I am working on in a different context, but it did not form part of my proposals for the steel industry. A reduction in working time does not form part of our proposals. You may be for or against the fact is that it is irrelevant as regards our proposals. Nowhere in our proposed measures do we refer to the kind of reduction in working time which you have been talking about here. What we have proposed is a kind of short-time working — in other words, a temporary reduction in working time — to take account the lack of orders, which is not the same as a permanent reduction in working time. The idea is to deal with cases which at the moment do not qualify for aid under Article 56 by offering financial aid for a transitional period — and this is something you have asked for — to avoid the need for sudden dismissals from one day to the next.

Then there is the idea of a fifth shift. This is something on which we later adopted a more flexible political approach by referring to adjusting to the shift system. After the strike in the Federal Republic of Germany — in which, of course, we were not involved in any way — it turned out, however, that the Germans had settled voluntarily, albeit after a struggle, for what they call the 'free shift'. The fifth shift is something which has been regarded as a very urgent matter throughout the Community, but so far nothing has come of it. The idea therefore by definition enjoys less priority in our proposals. It has been found in practice that it is extremely difficult to reach agreement between workers and employers on the introduction of any form of fifth shift, especially when the idea is to help prevent the loss of jobs. I hope that this dispels any misunderstanding on the kind of reduction in working time you have been talking about. I should be sorry if, in taking a vote — which of course I have no right to interfere with, that being your own sovereign province — you were prevented from reaching agreement by factors outside the subject proper.

That would be a pity, because it would detract from the proposals, which have nothing to do with this point. Of course, I have my own views on this matter, which I would not seek to deny: just look at what the Commission is doing to try to bring workers and management together. Of course, we have definite views here, but let me repeat that our proposals do not cover this.

Times change, but one point of lasting importance I should like to comment on is the question of early retirement, which is the most important element in the arsenal of measures we have put forward. I can demonstrate the importance of this matter with reference an application we received only recently from France relating — believe it or not — to something in the region of 3 700 million French francs, which corresponds to a contribution of 300 million EUA from us. We are expected to cough up 300 million

EUA over a period of three years for the French steel industry alone! I am prepared to bet that this application from France will be followed very quickly by a similar application for the same kind of amount from the United Kingdom. Roughly speaking, 80 % of the amount I just mentioned for the social measure proposed in France is earmarked for early retirement, most particularly for the category you have emphasized here in this House — the problem group of older blast-furnace workers, the ones who really do the hard work. For workers aged from 50 to 55 in this group, the two sides of industry have reached tripartite agreement with the French Government on a system of early retirement. We must therefore be realistic here. We are dependent on consultations between employers and workers, but we do not want to make consultation mandatory, and we do not wish to force it on anyone. The trade union movement would be the first to complain if we were to do so. We are therefore dependent on consultations between the national governments and the two sides of industry and it is only afterwards that we come into the picture.

The best example of this I have had experience of in the last four years is Luxembourg. It is an example of how things can be done without resorting to industrial action. The Luxembourgers have a tripartite consultation system, and have adopted social measures which we helped to work out in cooperation with the Luxembourg Government.

Mr President, from the political point of view I do not think there is much more for me to say. I listened attentively to what the various speakers in this debate had to say, and in particular to the contribution from Mr Nordlohne. I must say to Mr Nordlohne that I did not always follow what he was getting at politically speaking. He said that he had discussed the matter with Mr Peters. I have discussed the matter neither with Mr Peters nor with Mr Nordlohne, because my job is to remain objective and not to get involved.

I hope, though, that you will find some common ground in the normal process of give-and-take, without which nothing of any value can be achieved in this life. We very much hope that you succeed. Let me repeat that we are in a difficult situation now in view of the political fact that the 30 million EUA have been deleted in the course of the budgetary procedure. That is something I must draw your attention to again, because — from a political point of view at least — it has put us in a more tricky situation — *vis-à-vis* the Council. I hope that your *pro memoria* entry will not amount to an *in memoriam*. Personally I regard this as a defeat for Parliament in the budgetary procedure, but defeats have been known to lead to something constructive after all, and perhaps that will be the case here too.

I should like after all, overcoming a certain distaste, to say a few words to Mr Van Minnen who — so he said — spoke on behalf of the Socialist Group, though

**Vredeling**

afterwards we heard Mr Vetter also speaking on behalf of the Socialist Group.

I feel I must say my piece because I do not want to run the risk of allowing the hot air in Mr Van Minnen's contribution to keep his words floating around this Chamber for too long. In fact, Mr Vetter has done the job for me without my asking him, but that is the kind of thing I would expect from an experienced trade unionist like Mr Vetter who knows from close experience what efforts I have myself made to save those 30 million EUA.

You will gather, Mr President, that I value the remarks of Mr Vetter on behalf of the Socialist Group rather more than those of his party colleague, Mr Van Minnen. In any case, they cannot both be right. I think that anything I can add on this subject will be wasted for the simple reason that the allegations are untrue. We did not run away. In the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment of which Mr Van Minnen is a member, he never at any time told me that I ought to have come to the Committee. He never once said as much to me, despite the fact that, when I attend meetings of the Committee he sits directly opposite me. I must therefore calmly — I was a lot more worked up earlier — reject his accusations. We have not run away from our responsibilities. We have not sought refuge in mere words. We stuck to the 30 million EUA in the face of great resistance and many difficulties, and we did the same in the Consultative Committee. It was we who took the initiative. What Mr Calvez said just now is quite right. Most of the Consultative Committee — with three abstentions — gave its consent and that committee is made up of employers and workers in the steel industry. I feel that strengthens my case, and I believe that we must maintain our efforts. We shall now have to contend with the Council, and I am fully aware that the most difficult phase of all is still ahead of us. In view of the fact that your opinion is passed on to the Council, I can only take this opportunity to call on the Council, over your heads, to show political sense at a time when the steel industry is in such a vulnerable position. After all, the Community comes in for its fair share of criticism from the workers for being a Community in which economic and monetary considerations are given too much prominence. I have said once before, and I shall say it again today, that Europe is in danger of becoming a Europe of bankers.

Our measures have nothing to do with bankers. They are aimed at ordinary people who are threatened with redundancy as a result of the difficulties facing the steel industry, and we have a duty, by virtue of the Treaty, to take socially responsible measures rather than simply applying the cold hand of structural reorganization. Unfortunately, the whole complex network of measures, which go far beyond our own, for the creation of alternative jobs, is primarily a national responsibility. I was pleased to hear, however, that Mr Boyes wants to make it a Community matter. There is still some hope then of an anti-marketeer who

prides himself on being so can after all turn into a pro-marketeer.

**President.** — I call Mr Colla.

**Mr Colla.** — (NL) Mr President, Mr Vredeling said a number of things which I cannot really leave unanswered. I have no intention of interfering in his battle of words with Mr Van Minnen. Both of them are big enough and old enough to fight their own battles, but there are three things which I should like to draw to Mr Vredeling's attention.

Firstly, I agree with him that Parliament should have included 30 000 000 EUA in the 1980 budget for social measures in the steel industry, but if you intend to fire away at people, you ought at least to take good aim. I am sure Mr Vredeling knows that, in the course of the budget debate in Luxembourg, the Socialist Group tabled an amendment which was rejected by the rest of the House. So much for the first point.

Secondly, it is up to Mr Lange and Mr Dankert to decide which group they belong to, but I believe that Mr Lange, as Chairman of the committee, has to take note of what the Committee on Budgets decides and that Mr Dankert, as an objective rapporteur, can do no more than report what a majority of the committee thinks. Furthermore, as for the fact that the proposal to include several million EUA in the 1980 budget for social measures in the steel industry was not supported by a majority in the Committee on Budgets, this is partly due to the fact that the Commission indicated more or less unambiguously in the committee meetings that there was no prospect of anything coming of it this year, that it would be best not to press the point too much, and that a token entry was more than adequate. I believe that was how things were, and that is why a majority of the Committee on Budgets came out in favour of only a token entry.

Thirdly, I should just like to add that I am quite prepared to put up with criticism, but I note that the Commission's proposals for the 1981 budget do not include any fixed amount for social measures in the steel industry — just a token entry. I believe that these three points are worth placing on the record.

**President.** — I call Mr Barbi on a point of order.

**Mr Barbi.** — (I) I should like to know if the debate has been resumed.

**President.** — We are not resuming the debate. However, since we have some time available, it would not be a bad idea if one or two pertinent questions were raised.

**Mr Barbi.** — (I) Mr Colla did not put a question but in fact reopened the debate.

**President.** — I call Mr Nordlohne.

**Mr. Nordlohne.** — (D) Mr President, I have asked leave to speak in order to ask you to clarify a difference of interpretation between the Commission and Parliament. Mr Vredeling mentioned amendments. Amendments cannot be tabled to Commission proposals but only to the report. I just wanted to speak in order to clear up this misunderstanding. I should be grateful if we could get the matter straight, so that there is no chance of any difference or disagreement.

**Mr President.** — I call Mrs Castle.

**Mrs Castle.** — Mr President, my point of order was a point of correction. Mr Colla has made some of the points of correction I would have wished to make, but there was one statement I heard Mr Vredeling make which I feel must be taken up. He doubted whether my colleague, Mr Van Minnen, was, in fact, speaking for the Socialist Group. I want to assure Mr Vredeling that he was. He was speaking officially, and I hope Mr Vredeling will accept that fact.

**President.** — I call Mrs Dekker.

**Mrs Dekker.** — (NL) Mr President, I should like to add something by way of correction to what Mr Colla said. The proposal to include 30 million EUA in the budget for social measures in the steel sector also came from the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and not solely from the Socialist Group. I just wanted to make this point clear.

**President.** — I call Mr Vredeling.

**Mr Vredeling, Vice-President of the Commission.** — (NL) Mr President, I want to comment on the last remarks.

Mrs Dekker, what you said was true and I also do not want to cast any doubt on Mr Colla's fine intentions, but it was this Parliament's Committee on Social Affairs and Employment which introduced the proposal concerning the 30 million. I was at the meeting myself and I know that Mrs Dekker voted in favour...

**Mr Colla.** — (NL) I do not deny that an amendment was tabled by the Committee on Social Affairs as well.

**Mr Vredeling.** — (NL) ... We can say that we are both right, but that is irrelevant. What matters is who was in favour, and I want to clear up any misunderstandings on this point.

I am aware that Mrs Dekker voted for the amendment, but what you have not grasped is this: after the 30 million were turned down, Parliament knew that the budget was adopted. I cannot shift responsibility, and there is nothing you can do either. This is what happened. I am not getting at you personally, but at Parliament. I said as much when I spoke.

As for Mrs Castle's comments, I am quite ready to accept that Mr Van Minnen was speaking on behalf of the Socialist Group, but Mr Vetter spoke on behalf of the group as well. I merely said that they cannot both be right because what they said contradicts one another...

**Mr Van Minnen.** — (NL) We were both right.

**Mr Vredeling.** — (NL) ... yes, Mr Van Minnen, you are saying that to get out of it, but it is not quite right. That is all I wanted to say, Mr President.

**President.** — I call Mr Tugendhat.

**Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, I must say that I feel a little sheepish in intervening in a debate in which Dutch is so much the dominant language, but I hope very much that my short intervention in English will help to clarify a number of points.

First of all, so far as the politics of this matter is concerned, so far as the political priority, so far as the political importance of these matters are concerned, the Commission is absolutely united in emphasizing that they are important, that they are urgent, and that they are desirable. But of course, there are also a number of budgetary and technical problems which one has to take account of. It is not unpolitical to do that; it is realistic to do so, because one needs to ensure that everything is done in the proper fashion if the money is to be spent. The Parliament and the Commission must, I believe, lose no time in disagreements about modalities when there is such an urgent practical matter to be solved. The Commission has classified these credits — I am here referring to Mrs Hoff's report about the financing of the steel social measures — as non-obligatory expenditure, which is of course what Parliament wants. Now, I hope very much that Parliament will understand the need for a legal base to be accepted by the Council, because, as I have explained on many occasions, the budget is a necessary, but not in itself a sufficient condition for money to be spent. One cannot spend money if it is



**Tugendhat**

not in the budget, obviously not. One can bring forward supplementary budgets and so forth, but equally one has to have a legal base. The amendments of Mr Peters and Mr Spencer indicate that they are prepared to accept the need for a separate legal base, and I hope very much that the House will follow the sense of those amendments.

Now let me explain why this is. It is important, I think, that people understand why this is the case. First, the implementation of the measures in their present form depends on the Commission's taking the decision under Article 95 of the Treaty of Paris, needed to constitute a legal base for the new forms of aid. This in turn depends, as laid down in the Treaty, on the Council giving its unanimous agreement. It is the Council likewise which — in the view of the Commission — under Article 235 of the Treaty has to take the basic decision authorizing the transfer of funds from the general budget to the ECSC budget, on which Parliament is now being consulted. I think that once we have solved the Article 95 aspect, this latter part will follow relatively easily. When there is agreement on the substance of the proposals, the finance should be provided at the same time, a point to which the Commission with Parliament attaches very great importance.

So, Mr President, let me make it quite clear. The Commission and Parliament are at one in regarding the matter as urgent. I hope the House will see its way to adopting a report in a form which the Commission can accept, and on the basis of which it can, with Parliament, press the Council for action, which has been too long delayed, which, as speeches in all quarters of this House have made clear, is urgently required, and which really could do some practical good for people living in all parts of our Community who are at present facing very, very considerable difficulties.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Davignon.

**Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission.** — (F) I am pleased to be able to conclude this debate, since I can reply to the Oral Question by Mr Seal.

I am not going to recall the circumstances of our difficulties with the United States and of the anti-dumping action taken by United Steel against European producers. Mr Seal has outlined the technical and legal aspects of the situation perfectly. I therefore do not think it necessary, at this stage in the debate, to go into this aspect further.

What I would like to stress is that in a matter of this importance, all the groups represented in Parliament

have taken the difficulties between the European steel industry and the United States very seriously. The consensus arrived at between the United States, Japan and Europe to prevent the recession having adverse and even harsher effects on this industry is obviously, in the negotiations which the Commission is to conduct on behalf of the Community, the industrialists and those working in their industries, a major factor which I would not wish to underestimate. Here and now, I pledge my word to Parliament that I will try to do everything — and of course in the negotiations I will not adopt a position on any particular formula — to arrive at arrangements which will preserve our industry's exporting capacity to the United States, which is one of the indispensable factors in maintaining and successfully restructuring that industry. After making a report to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and to the Committee on External Economic Relations, I would be happy to report to you in September on the efforts which we shall keep on making in the meantime.

I the debate I also had the privilege of being taken to task by Mr Boyes. In the present spirit of unanimity between us, I feel I do not need to reply to his oversimplified criticisms.

**President.** — I call Mr Peters.

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I should like to thank all those who have spoken in this debate, and I should like to comment in detail on some of the arguments put forward by some of those speakers, starting with the Commission. I should like to point out to Mr Tugendhat that I have tabled two amendments to the Hoff report. But I now realize that these amendments would provoke a conflict between two sections of this House — the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and the Committee on Budgets. That would, I think, be counter-productive, and I shall therefore withdraw my amendments. The important thing now, even if you may have had, and still have, doubts as to the legal situation, is to support Parliament and — so to speak — force the Council to make this transfer on the basis of the position adopted by Parliament, rather than attacking Parliament's position as brought out in the views of the Committee on Budgets. I wanted to make that point so that no one entertains any false hopes on this score.

Secondly, let me say to Mr Vredeling that I take his point and agree with him that we must be prepared to give and take. We have a very difficult decision to make here. We have had a very exhaustive and contentious debate, but I realize as rapporteur that we need a majority in this House to enable us to provide help for the workers, especially specific aid measures for steel workers along the lines of the Commission's welcome proposals. I am quite sure that the dissenting

## Peters

colleagues from my own group see this as an important aim. But let us not forget that give-and-take does not mean that we must accept all positions without weighing them up against alternative proposals. I believe that the question of a reduction in working time is — if not the sole issue — at least the central issue here.

Let me first of all comment on what Mr Spencer had to say. He told us that his group could only accept paragraph 10a — which is the central point of the motion for a resolution — on early retirement, and that he also wanted to see paragraph 11 deleted on the grounds that the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment had referred to the facilities for early retirement under Article 56 (2) of the ECSC Treaty as a form of concealed dismissal. The fact is that the terms for early retirement are bogus because the only people who will be able to benefit from them are those who will be in a position to receive unemployment insurance benefits for a year before having to fall back on the normal unemployment benefit. In the Federal Republic of Germany, this unemployment benefit is calculated on a basis which takes into account a person's capital assets, such as his home, as well as his wife's earned income. That is certainly not what we would call early retirement. Paragraph 11 of the motion for a resolution says that early retirement as interpreted in the Commission's proposals is not a proper way to go about things. Let me point out once again to the Commission that what they propose is not the right solution. To then go and reject the other facilities is, in my opinion, a half-hearted thing to do, because these other provisions are just as important. This point has already been brought up in the course of this debate, so allow me just to say the following. The point at issue — especially as regards Mr Schön's speech — was the fifth shift. Neither the motion for a resolution nor the Commission's proposals call on anyone — government, employer or trade union — to make maximum use of all the terms of this catalogue, because we realize that there are far too many structural differences between countries, regions and steel-making companies. For instance, the question of the introduction of a fifth shift is a matter for serious discussion in the Netherlands, whereas it is not a practicable alternative in the Federal Republic of Germany, as the trade unions agree. But that is no reason for saying categorically that, because we do not want something in Germany, it is out of the question in the Netherlands as well, or vice versa. It is a positive advantage that the Commission's proposal should list the various possibilities, and that the method finally chosen should be left up to a contractual agreement between the Commission and the various Member States, with the agreement of the two sides of industry. It is because of this flexible approach that we need all the four possibilities from this catalogue to give differentiated help to the steel workers in the various countries.

If I may be allowed to add a word or two on the question of a reduction in working time, I should like to

associate myself with what Mr Friedrich had to say. Of course, there are bound to be differing views on the subject. You have — shall we say — painted a rather extreme picture — that is, after all, the kind of thing one sometimes has to do in a debate like this — of a reduction in working time giving rise to competitive disadvantages, and you gave us the example of a Japanese worker working on average a month per year more than his counterpart in Western Europe, for instance in the Federal Republic of Germany. Let me go to the opposite extreme with this particular example. According to you, the country with the longest working time should logically produce more to a higher standard than anywhere else. Of course, any such claim is ridiculous, because it is a fact that, by working a seven-day-week at minimum wage levels, you certainly do not get the best possible productivity, the highest quality and the lowest prices. A reduction in working time is only a minor element in price formation and a tiny factor in competition. Let me tell you that the opposite of what you say is in fact true, and that precisely in the highly-developed industrialized countries there must be a reduction in working time — either over the working life as a whole, or per year, week or day — to ensure that a massive increase in productivity as a result of the introduction of new machinery, new technologies and what have you, as well as higher productivity on the part of the workers, does not go exclusively to increase profits, but also serves to improve the standard of living and lead to a reduction in working time. That is not in itself a contradiction.

*(Applause)*

According to your scenario, the Japanese will rule the world in ten years' time because they always have better technologies and longer working time. The fact is though — as I am sure I do not need to tell you — that there are other factors of economic policy, foreign trade policy and contractual guarantees. I merely wanted to make the point that this is not a sensible line of argument.

In conclusion, I would point out that the question of a reduction in working time has been incorporated in the motion for a resolution as a result of majority support for our proposals in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment. I very much hope that the Commission's important social measures will find a broad majority in this House. But in view of the crisis facing the steel industry — and not only the steel industry, but also other industrial sectors — we need a better regional policy, more money and a better Social Fund. But along with social improvements within the European Community — not only for farmers, entrepreneurs and traders, but also for workers — we also need a reduction in working time, and that is something which rightly belongs in a resolution like this. We shall have to take a majority decision, and let me say to Mr Nordlohne that I think that even a trade-unionist and someone who is very close to the workers may have to accept a bit of watering-down, not as a

## Peters

matter of principle but simply in the interests of party unity and to get a majority in this House. Nonetheless, I think it should remain part of the motion for a resolution, and I would ask for Parliament's support.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

I have received from Mr Seal and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr van Aerssen on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (C-D Group), Sir Fred Catherwood on behalf of the European Democratic Group, Mr Donnez and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, Mrs Chouraqui on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats and Mr Leonardi a motion for a resolution with request for an early vote, pursuant to Rule 47(5) of the Rules of Procedure, to wind up the debate on the oral question (Doc. 1-316/80).

The vote on this request will take place at the beginning of tomorrow's sitting.

12. *Industrial products from third countries — motor vehicles, certain construction plant, textile names, electrical equipment and biodegradability; powered industrial trucks*

**President.** — The next item is the joint debate on three reports:

— report (Doc. 1-236/80), drawn up by Mr von Wogau on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-7/80) for a directive on a special Community certification procedure for industrial products originating in third countries;

— report (Doc. 1-141/80), drawn up by Mr von Wogau on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the

proposals from the Commission to the Council for directives

I. on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to rear-view mirrors for two or three-wheeled motor vehicles (Doc. 1-703/79)

II. (a) on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to roll-over protective structures (ROPS) for certain construction plant

(b) on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to falling-object protective structures (FOPS) for certain construction plant (Doc. 1-711/79)

III. amending Directive 71/307/EEC on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to textile names (Doc. 1-759/79)

IV. on the approximation of the laws of the Member States concerning electrical equipment for use in potentially explosive atmospheres in mines susceptible to fire-damp (Doc. 1-805/79)

V. on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to methods of testing the biodegradability of non-ionic surfactants and amending Directive 73/404/EEC (Doc. 1-823/79);

— report (Doc. 1-224/80), drawn up by Mr de Ferranti on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, on the

proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 192/79) for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to powered industrial trucks.

I call Mr von Wogau.

**Mr von Wogau, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the first report before you here today concerns the certification of products originating in third countries on the Community market. What is the background to this directive submitted to you by the Commission? The background is that a great number of Community certification directives, such as the directive on motor vehicles, have been drawn up by the Commission and are at present before the Council. If we could get things moving as regards these measures, which are currently being blocked by the Council, this would represent a considerable step towards opening up the markets in this area. On the other hand, however, certain Member States are blocking this directive because they are afraid that it would also entail opening up our markets to an increased influx of products from third countries with no guarantee of reciprocity, i.e. we could not count on being able to export our products to third countries on a similar basis. For this reason, the Commission has proposed a directive providing for a special procedure for ascertaining whether or not reciprocity exists.

Various other Member States, however, have expressed considerable anxiety regarding this directive as they are afraid that it might be used not only to guarantee reciprocity, but also as a basis for protectionist measures.

Account has been taken of this anxiety in the proposal by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs now before you, since we all agree that the policy of free trade under GATT has been very much to the advantage of all the citizens of this Community over the last few decades and that it would be very dangerous for us all if we were to fall back into our old mistake of protectionism.

We have proposed various amendments to this directive, which on the one hand are aimed at guaranteeing reciprocity so that this aspect of the directive may be fulfilled, while on the other hand excluding the possibility of abuse of this directive for protectionist purposes.

### Von Wogau

I should like to go over the main points on which our proposal and ideas differ from those of the Commission. Firstly, the term *reciprocity* needs, in our view, to be defined more specifically.

The term *reciprocity* regarding the acceptance of products from these various markets can undoubtedly be interpreted in two ways. Reciprocity must be guaranteed in administrative procedures. We cannot accept a situation whereby our administrative procedure is straightforward and that of the other countries repeatedly causes delays. This is the first and most important point.

Secondly, there are other obstacles to imports into third countries which do result not from legislation but from *de facto* arrangements between the governments, undertakings and distributors in certain countries, which guarantee that *de facto* import quotas are fixed and not exceeded. This is particularly true in the case of Japan. Here too, I take the view that this question must be examined from the point of view of reciprocity. However, ascertaining whether or not reciprocity exists cannot, of course, involve pointing out that the others have lower production costs or are at an advantage as regards exports because they have a weak currency. Investigating these points under the heading of reciprocity would be a clear infringement of the GATT free-trade provisions, and for this reason the term *reciprocity* should not be understood as referring to matters such as these. We also take the view that the application of this directive should be restricted to a small number of clearly defined groups of products.

The second proposal we would like to make is that the Commission's competency for the examination of questions of reciprocity should be increased, since it is primarily a question of verifying objective facts and not of reaching political decisions. For this reason, we take the view that this is a Community task which should primarily be the responsibility of the Commission, although the Member States should naturally be able to apply, as it were, an emergency brake in important cases. This is guaranteed under the procedure proposed in this report.

Thirdly, we make it quite clear that our approval of this directive is conditional on the adoption by the Council of the various proposals in this field which are currently blocked, for example the proposal relating to motor vehicles, since it would not make good sense, from our point of view, to approve this directive while at the same time failing to achieve our real aim, which is to open up the common market internally.

I should like to mention one last point in connection with this directive. We are dealing here with two things, firstly, the Council Decision of 15 January 1980 and secondly, this directive. Both relate to the same subject, but there are nevertheless differences in the wording and terms used and two different committees are involved, which is confusing for the

citizens of the Community who will subsequently have to live with this directive. In our view, these discrepancies should be eliminated. In this report, we have made various proposals, including some concerning the wording, the purpose of which is to make this directive clearer, and we hope that you will adopt this part of the report too. On these four conditions, I should like, on behalf of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, to urge this Parliament to adopt this report and the Commission's directive.

I come now to two further reports which are before you. Firstly, there is the report by Mr de Ferranti on powered industrial trucks, and secondly, the five further technical directives contained in the second report bearing my name.

Let me first of all make a number of remarks regarding the working party set up by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs to deal with this specific question of technical barriers to trade. We set ourselves the task of carrying out a sort of preselection process for the benefit of this Parliament, i.e. we attempted to establish which of these technical directives are in fact political in nature and which are genuinely of a purely technical nature, since it repeatedly happens in this field that there is a political motive behind what is ostensibly a purely technical question concerning, for example, the arrangement of the pedals on fork-lift trucks. It was the aim of this working party to let those directives which are of a purely technical nature pass but to bring up those which have a political content for discussions here in Parliament.

An example of the latter type of directive is contained in the report by Mr de Ferranti on powered industrial trucks or, in plain language, fork-lift trucks, and I must point out that the Chairman of this working party is an engineer and is obviously able to take a very different approach to these technical questions from that of a humble lawyer like myself. In this report it is in fact true to say that these technical questions conceal a major political issue. We have discussed this report and the Commission directive extremely exhaustively in a large number of sessions both of this working party and of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. It was not an easy matter to come to what was eventually a majority decision. We also took adequate account of the questions of safety which are involved, and I urge you to adopt this report by Mr de Ferranti.

An example of the other kind of directive is the report on the five other technical directives before you. These do not contain any political elements and I take the view that things of this kind should in future be passed without debate. I should now like to take this opportunity, ladies and gentlemen, to go into another question concerning a specific case. It is a fact that it is frequently very difficult to explain this question of technical barriers to trade to the ordinary citizen, since which of us has any idea of what a powered industrial

### Von Wogau

truck is? I must tell you that I too occasionally found the work on these reports by no means an easy matter. However, we all know what a circus is. The case I should like to describe to you concerns a circus which was held up for 50 hours not far from here on the bridge to Kehl before it could cross the Rhine into Germany. According to a report in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 150 artistes, 16 elephants, 86 horses, 16 lions, 5 tigers, 22 monkeys and 3 camels were involved. This circus was refused admission to Germany on the grounds that the permits and guarantees produced were not adequate. However, the report is based on the idea that in reality the real reasons were of a protectionist nature. This meant that the animals could not be fed for 50 hours, traffic was held up on this bridge for 50 hours and in the neighbouring town of Kehl traffic was totally disrupted at intervals. What are the people of the Community to make of this? If, 23 years after the signature of the Treaty of Rome you need 50 hours to get a circus from one side of the Rhine to the other and when this all takes place on a bridge called the *Europabrücke* the whole thing seems a bit of a joke.

Ladies and gentlemen, in my view, this is a clear case of infringement of both the spirit and the letter of the Treaty of Rome and I should like to ask Mr Davignon to do all he can to settle this matter as soon as possible and ensure that similar things do not happen in future.

**President.** — I call Mr de Ferranti.

**Sir Basil de Ferranti, rapporteur.** — Mr President, the illustration of the difficulties of crossing frontiers which Mr Von Wogau has just provided with his point about the circus is one that can be understood by everybody. But most businessmen who are concerned with the details of their daily business also have problems getting their goods across the frontiers. Many of them are cynical enough to say that there is no common market. Those sorts of comments do the Community no good. Indeed, they do not even really represent the truth. There has in fact, as we all of us know, been a fair amount of progress over the last 20 years. Many barriers have been removed, but the fact is that it is up to all of us who are interested — and most people, even though they do not attend our debates in the House, are in fact interested in this question — to keep up the effort and put in the necessary work that is required to make more real progress in this area of the Community's work. Most of the proposals that are held up are in fact held up in the Council. The probability is therefore that it is a political issue that underlies the difficulty of getting them through. And it is up to this Parliament to put in the necessary work to help the Commission with its task, to reduce the political issues and to get the directives through the Council at a greater speed. Now these three reports today illustrate the way in which we can contribute to more

progress. Mr Von Wogau has mentioned the report on fork-lift trucks, pointing out that not only is it difficult to pronounce in German as it is in our other languages but that of course it makes no immediate impression on the general public, unless you happen to work yourself in that particular industry, under which circumstances your whole life is bound by fork-lift trucks. Now, I put it to you that in fact most of us work in some kind of an industry which is comparatively obscure when its name is mentioned in this House. But when we do take the trouble to get down to the detail, that trouble is understood by people who work in the industry and it creates a response to our work which can enormously benefit the Community and help us to make more progress. If one is to understand the case of fork-lift trucks, one has got to picture in one's mind the actual details of the problem that arose in this particular case. I would ask you, colleagues, just to picture to yourself in your minds what it is like when you are actually driving a fork-lift truck. Some of these trucks are made with driving controls arranged in the same way as a motor car, that is to say they have a brake, a clutch and an accelerator and a lever which you move with your hand in order to change direction from forward to reverse. Manufacturers of this kind of truck claim that because it resembles a motor car it is more easily understood and therefore safer because there is less likelihood of confusion. Other manufacturers of fork-lift trucks make them in such a way that the hands are free to operate the hydraulic controls which are used to raise or lower the forks themselves and to manoeuvre the truck into position for its next task. Quite clearly, this has advantages in terms of productivity in that the forks can be in the right position while you are driving the truck into the right place for the next job. Manufacturers of this kind of truck claim that they are more productive and I think we should give credit here to the work of the Economic and Social Committee which delved into the necessary details and came up with the basic part of the evidence on which the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs and the working party were able to form their views. Now the essence of the difficulty is that, once one type of design is claimed to be safer, then clearly safety dominates all other considerations. And it would only be right for everybody involved to make a decision always in favour of safety.

The fact was though that there was no evidence at all, either way, to show whether one type of truck was more or less safe than the other. But nonetheless the manufacturers' claim to be safer was heeded and, in the absence of any evidence, the Commission, when it came to propose a directive to remove the barriers to trade in this area, reasonably, adopted that proposal which, if I may say, so was also, in the light of the lack of evidence, reasonably put forward. However, thanks to the interest created by this issue, this evidence has now been collected and an analysis of 189 accidents over the first 3 months of this year indicates clearly that only 6 could be attributed in any way to the

**De Ferranti**

arrangements of the pedals and that no conclusion could be drawn from those 6 accidents as to whether one type of pedal was more or less safe than the other type. If it is true that one design is just as safe as another design, then it must be right to allow manufacturers the freedom to compete with whichever design of pedals and controls best meets the market. It would not be right, if there is no evidence that one design is more or less safe than another, to inhibit technical progress in this field.

Interestingly enough, once this statistical analysis had been done — and it was much too late, it should have been done years earlier — it indicated that the biggest single cause of accidents was in fact trucks running over holes in the road or running over bricks in the factory which twisted the steering-wheel and broke arms and wrists. So, from this story has arisen one most useful conclusion, which could well save as many as 20 000 broken wrists and arms in the Community during a single year. It is in fact this, along with the all important question of training which is really fundamental to safety, which is our prime consideration.

I would hope, now that this further evidence is available, that the Commission will feel that it can adopt the recommendations in the report and accept that rather than simply adopting the automotive type — the motor-car type of controls — advocated in its original proposal, it would be best if the pedal arrangements were to be in accordance with international standards.

There is much more to be said about fork-lift trucks. But perhaps I have gone into more detail on this occasion than has ever been gone into before on a technical barrier to trade of this kind. Suffice it to say that it was only really as a result of lack of statistics that this question was raised and that politics raised its ugly head at all. But the fact is that if you are trying to work in the technical barriers to trade area, as we can see by the delays in the Council, politics does frequently rear its ugly head and it is up to us in this Parliament to look into the details when that is so.

As regards the other item — Item No 94, a report by Mr von Wogau — as the rapporteur himself has said, it illustrates the way in which we can make progress with this work: by wrapping a group of these directives, where there is no political issue, into one package and passing it through the Parliament we will be able to make rapid progress. In fact, interestingly enough, there is one small detail still remaining to be settled which will be raised by my colleague, Mr Moreland, in relation to three-wheel trucks and the rear-view mirrors with which they are fitted. This illustrates once again that, even if it is not political, we can in this House provide a service by being able to point things out even at the very last minute.

Also in this directive, Mr President, there is one proposal in the conclusions which relates to the ques-

tion of constructional plant. I put in an amendment to this myself which I would now like formally to withdraw. It was based on a misunderstanding in the English text. Nonetheless, I would be grateful if the Commissioner could in his winding-up just confirm again that the framework directive for constructional plant is an Article 100 directive and that it is not intended to use Article 155 in this directive. The working party in fact is now considering the use of Article 155 in framework directives and I hope we will be able to come to conclusions on that subject in the not too distant future.

I would if I may, Mr President, like to congratulate Mr von Wogau on his work on No 139 — the report on the third-country proposals. This is a very important issue indeed. It will give the Community a bargaining instrument which can be used primarily to open up other markets to our goods. But it was a most difficult one to devise. The contribution which the rapporteur has made will, I believe, help to make it acceptable to Member States and get it through the Council. If he succeeds, if the Commission succeeds and if the Council makes a decision, there will be some real evidence of progress. Many people, I think, feel that this whole area of harmonization of laws is so big, so intractable, as to be almost impossible to deal with. But, in fact, 120 directives have been passed out of a probable total of maybe only 200 directives that are really needed to break the back of this job. If this third-country proposal goes through, we will have 12 more directives in the bag and we will have really made considerable progress. That progress will have been made in no small measure thanks to the extra efforts that will have been put in by the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, by its chairman and by the working party that we have been able to set up. These three proposals today illustrate the need to get on with detail where detail is required, see where there is a political issue, and to get through the ones that do not require any attention as rapidly as we possible can. Above all, we need to recognize that out there 250 million people really want this Parliament and this Community to make progress in removing barriers to trade.

**President.** — I call Mr Moreland, spokesman for the Committee on Transport.

**Mr Moreland, draftsman of an opinion.** — We would like to congratulate the rapporteur on his report. I must say personally that I was a little worried about his example of the circus, because I read in an article recently on the problem of three sites which happened to be headed: 'The circus has got stuck on the road'. I hope that that will not be an omen for our future. The Committee on Transport, whose opinion is attached to the report, welcomes the section relating to rear-view mirrors for two and three-wheeled vehicles. We believe that the compulsory fitting of mirrors on both

**Moreland**

sides of such vehicles would improve the sphere of vision of the driver and consequently improve road safety.

I emphasize the safety aspect because of a consideration drawn to the committee's attention after we had delivered our opinion to the rapporteur's committee and his committee had drawn up its report. Apparently a problem arises in the case of three-wheeled saloon cars. Such cars are produced and sold in the Community. Indeed, it so happened that the leading producer is in the area which I represent. Obviously, when one is considering the sphere of vision in such vehicles one's first thought is for a mirror inside the vehicle looking through the rear window. Yet the directive does not mention the requirement to have a rear view mirror inside. So it must be amended to include such a requirement. The directive does refer to two mirrors outside. Personally, I believe that two exterior mirrors do improve vision. Nevertheless, the directives that refer to fourwheeled vehicles, — Directives No 71/127/ and No 79/795/, — require, in addition to the interior rear view mirror, one external offside rear view mirror. As three-wheeled saloon cars compete against small four-wheeled cars such as small Volkswagens, Renaults and British Leyland Minis, it is only fair that they should be obliged to follow the same requirement, namely, one interior and one exterior rear-view mirror. The amendments down in my name are designed for this purpose. I emphasize that the amendments have to be down in my name as the Committee on Transport was not informed of the problem until after it had adopted its opinion.

I understand that at meetings of officials of Member States held on this subject in June, there was a failure to agree on three-wheeled vehicles. I cannot believe that it is beyond the wit of man to reach agreement on this issue. I would hope member governments will give a political kick to get an agreement, because I really do not think that this is the sort of thing that I should have to raise as a politician at a full meeting of this Assembly. It is surely an issue on which agreement should have been reached behind the scenes, one on which it was easy to reach agreement. I therefore hope that the House will support my amendment and perhaps give a political kick to some of the officials of member governments.

IN THE CHAIR: MR ZAGARI

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Turner to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Turner.** — Mr President, I want to speak for a few moments on the nature of these technical direc-

tives even though they often make non-technical people laugh. They are serious matters as Mr De Ferranti and Mr von Wogau have rightly pointed out.

The old Parliament encouraged framework directives and the use of the Article 155 procedure for subsidiary directives under them, because it felt it could not deal with the technical issues raised in these kinds of problems. Now, I think that is entirely wrong. The political issues that arise in these technical directives are just as likely to be found in the subsidiary directives as in the framework directive. Indeed, it is probably more likely that the standards set in the subsidiary directives will raise more political problems than the framework one. When I say political problems, I mean a conflict between interests in the EEC. I believe the new Parliament must not abdicate its obligations to be the primary political forum merely because it is dealing with complex matters.

The Commission hears complaints from what you might call pan-European associations, trade associations representing the whole of Europe. It also, of course, hears national governments' representatives' views. However those do not necessarily put forward objections which arise from conflicts between interests in one country or between interests which spread across more than one country but do not happen to be national interests. The Economic and Social Committee has told the working party that it does not wish to deal with political matters. The Council of Ministers deals with national governments but will not necessarily deal with political matters when it concerns interests within a state or interests crossing national boundaries which are not national interests themselves. I believe that this sort of political problem can only be picked up by the European Parliament and by its 410 Members who are close to the ground and close to their electors.

I think that Parliament must reassert its responsibility in fields in which the old Parliament, I believe, relaxed its hold. I think that Sir Basil de Ferranti was completely right when he said that this Parliament is not only a lightning conductor to identify problems but is also a very good forum in which to settle these problems. It is probably a better forum than the Council of Ministers itself. I have proposed to the working party perfectly practical proposals to enable us to get through technical directives when they are purely technical with no political issue, very speedily and without troubling this Parliament at all. On the other hand, when a directive has got a political content, then the full procedure would be applied. I put this in a note to the working party which I hope will be considered at its next meeting. I would just like to add that it does not involve changing any of the rules of this House. Therefore I think it is something which it is perfectly practical to do.

**President.** — I call Mr Delorozoy to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Delorozoy.** — (*F*) Mr President, we agree to a very large extent with the views of Mr von Wogau and Mr de Ferranti on simplified and more rapid procedures that could be used for issues like the one submitted to our Parliament. This would undoubtedly enable us, as they pointed out, to make more rapid progress, to arrive at more effective and rational applications and thereby more rapidly remove a number of technical barriers to trade that undoubtedly impede the development of the Community. Nonetheless, the Members of this House must have already understood from what Mr von Wogau and Mr de Ferranti said that in the final analysis, things are not so easy. Mr von Wogau indeed stated: 'Pedals are a political issue' and Mr de Ferranti: 'This is a purely technical issue' and he admitted at the end of his statement that it was sometimes difficult to separate the one from the other.

In fact, when the working party met in a bid to settle the differences — which may well make you smile — in the methods of using the controls of powered industrial trucks, it decided to wait for the opinion of the specialists of the Economic and Social Committee. The Economic and Social Committee expressed its opinion at its meeting on 26 March 1980, and since this opinion obviously did not meet the expectations of the majority of the working party, the discussion took on a political dimension. The technical opinion was not taken into consideration. In this connection, I would like to say that the services of the Commission, together with their experts, have in our view, carefully and expertly prepared the directive submitted for our examination. They carried out — and they said so before our committee — a wide-ranging joint consultation before proposing this directive. It is a pity that our group is unable today to give full approval to this essentially technical and particularly well-prepared directive because the matter has been turned into a political issue.

Nowadays, Mr de Ferranti, statistics are made to say a number of things. However, statistics are somewhat like pretty women's dresses that help discover pleasant things and sometimes also hide the essentials. You mentioned that in the fatal accidents statistics, most of the accidents were caused by driving mistakes — this is true, handling is sometimes a bit too fast in workshops — and that only 6 out of 200 accidents were caused by pedal faults. The truth is that most serious accidents — and you know that several people have died in my country in particular — are caused by the use, during a working day, of a lay-out different from the one used in motor-cars.

Now, we all know that, for a worker who has to perform the same operation for a number of working hours, controls become intuitive, specific and instinctive, and he then has to take account of these acquired reflexes in order to drive a motor-car on a road. We should therefore not take into consideration only those statistics on accidents occurring at the place of

work. We should go much further and examine overall statistics on accidents arising from the use of this type of vehicle.

You have, moreover, admitted yourself, Mr von Wogau that only very few undertakings were concerned. So, why not adapt this mechanism since, in fact, only about 10 out of 200 European manufacturers use a system that is slightly different and since, in fact there are only three companies out of about forty of any importance that use this reversed mechanism.

In my opinion, politics were wrongly brought into a matter which could have remained primarily technical — undoubtedly difficult to explain to the general public, but understandable when it is shown, in a simple and elementary manner that, in safety standards for powered industrial trucks, it is essential to recommend the use of the same type of pedals used for driving motor-cars rather than having all sorts of different mechanisms that cause danger and insecurity.

This is why we have tabled an amendment deleting paragraph 4 (b) of the motion for a resolution contained in the report on powered industrial trucks. However, most of us hope to be able to adopt this report which is otherwise perfectly in line with our expectations. In any event, we hope that during the final drafting of the directive, the Commission will bear in mind the serious danger to which it would be exposing both industrial workers and the general public on the roads if it failed to abide by the said rule — which we consider extremely important — of maintaining pedal arrangements identical with those of the motor-car.

**President.** — I call Mr Nyborg on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mr Nyborg.** — (*DK*) Mr President, my Group has instructed me to say that we cannot support the de Ferranti report on the proposal by the Commission for a directive on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to powered industrial trucks as we think the Commission's original proposals are preferable. We therefore intend to vote against this report.

As regards Mr von Wogau's report on the certification of industrial products originating in third countries, I should like to make a few comments. We are very pleased at the extremely painstaking work Mr von Wogau has done, and we should like at the same time to point out that we take a very positive view of the free-trade policy as set out in the GATT agreement.

The world as such, and particularly the Western world, should not fall back on protectionism even if the economic situation is difficult and economic growth extremely limited. Protectionism is something



## Nyborg

we regard as very dangerous. In our view, reciprocity is essential for a freer form of trade whereby both importers and exporters enjoy the same conditions. The Commission's proposal for Community certification on the basis of type testing does not specify any criteria for reciprocity of this kind, nor does it list the groups of products to be covered by this system of certification. These are also the two main points which Mr von Wogau singled out for criticism in his report. It is not entirely satisfactory to leave these matters to the individual Member States as proposed by the Commission, or to the Commission, as suggested in the present report. Account must be taken of the system of harmonization, since total harmonization might result in an imported product being excluded from a national market. If, on the other hand, harmonization is made optional, this could lead to the setting up of new barriers to the movement of goods within the Community since individual Member States would be able to exclude imports of products previously imported into and approved by other Member States. This sort of thing is precisely what we are trying to avoid. What we would like is to see a system whereby an imported product would enjoy free movement once it had crossed the external borders of the Community.

The restrictions on the movement of these goods should be minimized as far as possible and there should no longer be any need for the goods to be accompanied by the certificates of origin etc. at least not under the control of the authorities. If a buyer needs the information currently contained in a certificate of origin, you can be sure he will see to it himself that he gets it from the seller. We must make the movement of goods within the Community as free as possible regardless of whether they are produced within the Community or imported from a third country.

I should also like to refer to a point I made a few years ago in connection with the report on the customs union, which made mention of the difficulties arising from the suspicion regarding the criteria governing the import of goods from third countries into the Community. On that occasion, I suggested that we could do something to dispel this doubt by setting up a common Community customs authority, so that, as far as possible, all the Member States could be represented at the external borders of the Community.

The European Progressive Democrats have always been opposed to the setting up of barriers which might impede the free movement of goods within the Community. We must admit that the report contains many positive things, such as a proposal to reduce the bureaucracy — here we might make a comparison with the proposal contained in Article 8 of the Council Decision of 15 January 1980 to use an existing committee instead of setting up a new one to do, so to speak, the same job. However, I should nevertheless like to say that it will not be possible for the European

Progressive Democrats to vote in favour of this report, not because we have anything against the work done by Mr von Wogau — as I said at the beginning, we think he has done an excellent job — but because, in our view, the Commission's proposal was such that it has not been possible to amend it sufficiently.

Finally, I must say that I was amazed to see an amendment tabled by Mr de Ferranti, even if it has since been withdrawn. This amendment related to another report drawn up by Mr von Wogau and advocated deleting paragraph 4 of his motion for a resolution. I just do not understand how people can propose amendments of this kind. I can welcome the fact that it has been withdrawn, but I find it somewhat peculiar when one considers that Mr de Ferranti is chairman of the working party which discussed these questions and submitted them to the Committee for adoption.

**President.** — I call Mrs Hammerich.

**Mrs Hammerich.** — (DK) Mr President, in a debate which covers as many different subjects as this — from a general import policy to industrial trucks etc. — we obviously cannot deal with any of them in great depth. I will therefore restrict my remarks to the two proposals for directives concerning construction plant.

In spite of their highly technical titles, the proposed directives in fact concern matters which are very simple, i. e. the harmonization of the structures necessary to protect the drivers of vehicles such as cranes or bulldozers, on building sites from accidents resulting from the vehicles overturning or being hit by falling objects. These are absolutely vital safety requirements, and detailed requirements for plant of this kind have existed for a long time in many countries, including Denmark. Why then should we harmonize? For the usual reasons. The Community wishes to eliminate technical barriers to trade. Nothing should stand in the way of the free movement of goods. The Community wishes to be large a standardized market in which construction plants, for example, can be sold freely without coming up against tiresome national requirements.

An effective market. Effective for whom? For the major undertakings, of course, the multinationals etc. It is the effectiveness of companies such as these which is to be promoted, and one is tempted to believe that this is what the Treaty of Rome is really all about.

Now there may well be people here today who believe that the aim of the proposed directives is to protect construction workers. However, we must make no mistake about which came first. Safety requirements originated in the places of work in the Member States. Subsequently safety legislation was introduced in the Member States. Only after this did the Commission, come up with its proposals to the effect that the

**Hammerich**

national safety provisions should be harmonized on the grounds that, as the Commission itself said in so many words, the national provisions regarding protective equipment constitute barriers to trade within the Community. The real motive behind harmonization is to eliminate such barriers to trade. This means total harmonization, which in turn means, as the Commission itself says in so many words, that the Member States will no longer be able to prohibit or restrict the marketing or use of plant fulfilling the requirements of the directive.

The proposed provisions are of a very general nature, and the individual Member States will be powerless to make them more restrictive. It is not only the People's Movement against the EEC which is opposed to total harmonization of this kind, the Danish Government and authorities are also opposed to it. So far, Denmark's requirements as regards construction plant have been extremely stringent. It has been possible to reject plant which failed to meet these requirements. Furthermore, the requirements were drawn up by a body known as the *Arbejds miljø råd*, or Council for the Working Environment, which consists of workers, employers and specialists and as such is one of our many democratic bodies. The *Arbejds miljø råd* was able to adapt safety requirements in the light of the rapid developments. If this total harmonization becomes a reality, this will involve Denmark handing over its control of this aspect of the working environment to foreign countries, in the form of the Community, which may well result in a direct deterioration of our legislation regarding the working environment, and hence a direct risk to our construction workers since we ourselves will no longer be in a position to impose more stringent requirements than the Commission is able to introduce. The Community bureaucracy will not be able to work out safety regulations which keep pace with the very rapid technological developments. The directives are not dynamic. The control of safety at the place of work is slipping out of the hands of the very persons affected by it, i.e. the construction workers. The competency of the *Arbejds miljø råd* is being undermined for the benefit of distant bureaucratic structures which are ruled by technocrats, and are most probably influenced by major industrial lobbies. This is a very specific example of what we mean when we say that membership of the Community is for us a step backwards from the point of view of democracy.

**President.** — I call Mr Davignon.

**Mr Davignon, Member of the Commission.** — (F) Mr President, I will start with Mr von Wogau's report, which deals with five directives since in this context only a single question was asked by Mr de Ferranti who wanted to make sure that the legal basis for the five directives was Article 100. My answer to this question is affirmative, which does not mean that I agree with Mr Turner on framework directives. This is not

the subject of today's discussion. My answer on this specific point is simply that the directives under discussion are based on Article 100.

As for the directive dealing with powered industrial trucks, I am grateful to Mr de Ferranti for taking pains to explain very lucidly to Parliament why a question that may seem secondary should rightly concern not only the departments of the Commission, but also the Committee and the Members of this House.

I think his explanation was excellent. We have to see which guarantees we can give manufacturers at the time they are making investments, because it is quite obvious that insofar as the standards are not known or insofar as the standards are changed during production, machine tools have to be modified and the situation becomes even much more uncertain, Mrs Hammerich, for small and medium-sized undertakings than for big ones. It will always be possible for multinational undertakings to place their pedals on the ceiling if they need to. They can do it more easily than a small undertaking which has a special situation and depends on a single model. In Europe, there are 75 undertakings that produce powered industrial trucks, which means that there are very many small and medium-sized undertakings in this sector. So please let us get away from the oversimplified argument that the Community is only interested in one type of undertaking and is not at all concerned with big undertakings, which are left to manage on their own.

I would very simply answer the question by saying that we have a choice.

I am neither an engineer nor an expert in these matters. I am simply trying to look at them with as much common sense as possible. The only way to progress, I think, is to try and show common sense. I consider myself a sensible person, able to take in facts. I am not saying what is safer or less safe — that is something you find out afterwards and not at the beginning. If I were working all day long where I had to apply brakes with one foot and on my way home in the evening I had to apply the brakes of my car with the other foot, I might sometimes make a mistake. I consider myself neither hyperintelligent nor a complete moron, i.e. more or less like the ordinary members of the Commission of the European Communities.

(Laughter)

The argument seems quite sensible. The question was to know whether or not we would add a safety requirement to those corresponding to established international standards. Was it necessary to go a step further or not? I feel that the procedure adopted is a sensible one. We intend to go a step further, but during a period of five years everyone is allowed a chance to adjust. In other words, those manufacturers who make a specific type have five years to adjust and

## Davignon

can sell their products. They do not have any problem since they have a period of adjustment. I do not mean that this is the final word, since Mr de Ferranti outlined a number of important points and drew our attention to the need for more specific and tangible technical data.

Secondly, the present situation in which the internal market is not working smoothly is not good and cannot be allowed to continue. We shall of course examine the points raised by Parliament and the vote it will cast tomorrow, but I just wanted to express my opinion. With regard to common sense and deadlines, we are being fair and are not threatening anybody's interests by forecasting the future. Given the manner in which the proceedings have been carried out, it is likely that this is the quickest way of arriving at a directive. In any event, however, even if my colleagues and I do not decide to follow Parliament's report, I assure you that Mr de Ferranti's report will be submitted by the Commission to the Council's technical working party which will look into this matter, as the report contains a number of interesting and important points. Whether the Commission supports them or not, they constitute topics for discussion. But we are not going to waste time on this or that wording, neither Mr de Ferranti nor myself. We want something that will be meaningful in the final analysis. This is the assurance I wanted to give him and at the same time explain why I am not yet fully convinced by his arguments.

I now come to Mr von Wogau's report on certification. We have the same concerns, the same worries, and we want to do things satisfactorily. We have the same list of priorities. First of all, we have to get out of the deadlock in which we find ourselves in the Council, as 12 or 13 directives are being held up because no agreement has been reached on acceptance, and this affects the smooth running of the internal market, which in a period of recession is once more vital especially for small cross-border undertakings, since it is these which are faced with the most difficulties in this situation. We must therefore get out of this I hope we all agree. It is therefore logical that the Parliament and the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs should ask the Council what it is doing about these directives. If I am the only one to speak on behalf of Parliament and it does not itself ask the Council a number of questions, the procedure is not complete. I am not trying to stir up Parliament against the Council, but it seems normal that Parliament should ask the Council how far the procedure has gone and not ask the Commission how things stand in the Council. It should discuss basic issues with the Commission and the development of the procedure with the Council.

Furthermore, the agreements which we have negotiated with GATT and which provide for reciprocity should facilitate this harmonization of the market. Such an opening up of the markets is neither a protec-

tionist nor a naïve move. We are not going to allow imported products into our Community because certification operates automatically while it would take, under the same conditions, a month or a year for our products to get into another country. It is a question of equivalent procedures. There can be the same written rules but, under certain circumstances, it can take a year to implement a regulation and, under other circumstances, it can take 24 hours. This is obviously not a fair balance.

I quite understand Mr von Wogau's requests in this respect. What does reciprocity mean? Frankly speaking, reciprocity has no formal constitutional definition. Reciprocity is a type of behaviour. It is not just a question of complying with certain formal rules. I promise the House that when the directives on type-approval have been approved by the Council, I shall explain to the Committee or to its working party how we shall try to organize this reciprocity without being naïve and without trying to be protectionist. Lastly, Mr von Wogau made a number of proposals on the improvement of decision-making procedures at committee level. I must say that most of them are better drafted and more explicit than our initial proposal, and I would ask Parliament to allow me certain amount of leeway in discussing this with the Council because, after all, the best procedure is the one accepted by all. The best procedure — given that it works, is precise and practical, respects the powers enjoyed by the various parties and does not bring the system to a standstill — is the one on which everybody can agree. We shall try to simplify certain things, but it should be pointed out that some of these directives have been under discussion in the Council for the past three or four years. I must also make sure that, in submitting a new proposal, I do not give the Council another opportunity of entrusting the documents to external experts and consultancy bureaux, which would make us lose six months.

I must say that I am quite taken by the spirit and aims of this report. In a number of cases it has the edge on our proposals. I would ask Parliament and in particular the representatives of the working party, to appreciate that in the discussions with the Council I need enough leeway to enable me to avoid any blunders which might prevent us achieving what we all agree is our first priority, namely that these directives should at last be adopted once and for all.

That, Mr President, is what I wanted to say on the three reports. I will conclude with two remarks.

First of all, I wish to thank the Chairman of the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, Mr Delors, and the rapporteurs, Mr von Wogau and Mr de Ferranti. I also wish to thank the latter in his capacity as chairman of the working party responsible for studying these technical barriers. To explain how important these directives are for the citizens of the Community and for making their lives easier, we have

**Davignon**

done more work in the last four months than we have done for a long time.

Lastly, I would tell Mr von Wogau that as soon as I heard about the difficulties encountered at the border by the Italian circus with an American name, an enquiry was opened. I will submit its findings to the Committee and Parliament in the manner Mr von Wogau deems most appropriate. We shall see whether there are any lessons to be learned from the incident, whether there was any infringement or whether — as happens sometimes — the blame is on both sides. We must make an effort to inform people so that they are better aware of the rules and directives, thus ensuring that their rights are better protected. Mr President, these are the comments I wanted to make on the various points. The Commission is very satisfied with the way these technical and difficult questions which may sometimes raise a smile, have been handled, and I feel that this should enable us to arrive at a thorough consensus on how to harmonize our work in future.

**President.** — I call Mr de Ferranti.

**Mr de Ferranti, rapporteur.** — Mr President, I should like to thank the Commissioner very much for the way he has accepted our points and is prepared to pass them on the Council and to his colleagues in the Commission.

I would like, with great sincerity, to make one point only. Of course, common sense and reasonableness are what are required. These issues would never have become political if we had had better facts on which to draw reasonable conclusions, I would only say this to him. Please, it is no good simply requiring the directive to be optional for five years. If you are doing the wrong thing, it is just as bad to do the wrong thing in five years' time. It is no consolation to be told that we have five years in which to adapt. What we must do is get the decision right in the first place, and I am sure that the way he has proposing to go about it represents the epitome of common sense itself. I very much hope that more statistics will become available during the process of the Council discussions and that it will be possible to come to a satisfactory conclusion. If we do so, it will be very largely thanks to the Commission.

**President.** — I call Mr von Wogau.

**Mr von Wogau, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, I should like to reply very briefly to the various questions which have been brought up.

Firstly I should like to say to Mr Moreland that I find his two amendments regarding three-wheeled vehicles reasonable. I also note that the Commission too is in agreement with these amendments from the technical

point of view and I suggest that Parliament support them when the vote is held tomorrow.

Then there were Mr Turner's observations regarding the procedures which should be used in the working party and in Parliament. I know from discussions with Mr Turner that this proposal is very constructive and opens up a new possibilities, since our major concern is naturally to find the best possible way of distinguishing between technical matters and those which are of a more political nature. In my view, his proposal constitutes an excellent starting point and we will make it the subject of an exhaustive discussion at the next or next but one meeting of our working party, after which we will probably submit a proposal to Parliament later this year along the lines he suggests.

I should now like to comment very briefly on the points made by Mr Delorozoy and Mr Davignon regarding the directive on fork-lift trucks. We have devoted considerable attention to the question of the arrangement of the pedals. I personally am no specialist in this field, but I have listened to the most widely differing opinions on this matter and I can assure you that we in the working party have devoted very serious attention to the question of safety and accidents which have been mentioned. I might, at this juncture, describe very briefly how a fork-lift truck operates. It is different from an ordinary motor vehicle in that, in many cases, it alternates regularly between forward and reverse movement. This change of direction is controlled by means of a toggle switch which is certainly not a method used in driving an ordinary car. I got the impression from the various conversations and discussions that driving a fork-lift truck is fundamentally different from driving a car and that the only possible danger could stem from the fact that the arrangement of pedals is similar to that in a car but the other way round. However, as it stands, the Commission directive would, for example, prohibit the use of the toggle switch, which I no means regard as a bad thing. For this reason, we should, I think, give our support to Mr de Ferranti's proposal on this matter and to the request which was also made here to the effect that training for fork-lift truck drivers should be improved, since not everyone who can drive a car can also drive a fork-lift truck straightaway. These points, I think, sum up the long debate on the question of fork-lift trucks.

Next, I should like to thank Mr Nyborg for the points he made, to which I listened very attentively as I know that he has many years of very creditable experience in this field and that it is to a great extent thanks to him that this Parliament has taken major initiatives in this field in the past. I also know that he has a very strong personal commitment to free trade, which is a common objective. However, I did not quite understand from what he said why the Group of European Progressive Democrats rejects this directive. I do not know whether it was mainly out of concern for the opening up of the internal market or because of the

von Wogau

wish to maintain free trade, or because of the fear of protectionism. As far as I am concerned this question was not made clear. As regards Mrs Hammerich's contribution to this debate, I fully endorse what Mr Davignon said, i.e. that barriers to trade of this kind are not a problem to major undertakings, but that it is the small and mediumsized undertakings which are in this way prevented from making use of the advantages offered by the Common Market, i.e. the advantages of the bigger market which enable producers to produce more cheaply and to a higher standard and also serve the interests of the consumers within the Community in that this competition on a European scale and the possibilities of cheaper production mean that these products may be produced to higher standards and made available to the consumers more cheaply. This is our main concern.

Finally, I should like to thank Mr Davignon for his very swift reaction to the specific case I brought up. I am very interested to hear the Commission's view on these matters and how it will in fact be possible to influence them for the better. I should also like to thank him for the support he has given to my report and for the assurance that the Commission will act accordingly. Naturally, as regards these questions of wording, Parliament is not overconcerned about the wording as such, but rather about highlighting the common aim and basis of the report. What we are trying to do is to make a common effort to get things moving in the Council so that we may be able in this cooperation between the Commission and Parliament to make some real progress towards this common aim which is the practical realization of the Common Market in Europe, even though the individual steps may be small and sometimes difficult.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

### 13. *Integration of railway undertakings*

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-267/80), drawn up by Mr Cottrell on behalf of the Committee on Transport, on the

objectives to be pursued in the long term and the measures to be taken to promote partial or total integration of railway undertakings at Community level.

I call Mr Cottrell.

**Mr Cottrell, rapporteur.** — I think that this report, whilst it may seem of relatively little significance, does in fact have enormous significance for the future of this Community. A little while ago we had the Venice Summit, a great deal of which was devoted to the problem of energy consumption within the Commu-

nity. The communiqué issued at the conclusion of the summit referred specifically to the fact that Europe and the western world represented at that summit must treat the development of energy — saving transport systems as one of its highest priorities. Transport is very much more to this Community than merely the movement of goods and people by road, by rail, by waterway, by coastal shipping and by air. Transport is the jugular vein of this Community. If there is no transport, there is no industry, there is no commercial and economic life. We have reached a stage in the affairs of this world where energy has now become perhaps our prime consideration, although I regret to say I see precious little recognition of this fact in the Community today, and in particular within my own country.

We have wilfully over the years neglected the development of transport systems which are energy-efficient. We have used our money before we earned it. We imagine that the discovery of new oil resources, whether they are in the North Sea or whether they are in the jungles of Venezuela, will somehow postpone the evil day which is upon us. so I hope that this House will see my report in the context of that situation.

I would like to remind the House that, if there is an energy-efficient transport system, then it is the railway. Railways within the existing Community use approximately 1.5 % of our fuel resources and they then use that 1.5 % of our fuel resources to move 43 % of the passengers and 25 % of the freight which are moved within every 24-hour period. What have we done with our railways over the years, the cinderella of our transport systems? We have totally and completely neglected them. I shall quote in this context Sir Peter Parker, Chairman of British Rail, who recently told the Transport Committee of the House of Commons:

Unless our investment levels are lifted by some 30 % just to replace worn out assets, the consequences will be lower standards of speed, frequency, comfort and reliability of rail services. This is not a progress into decline which can be reversed overnight or corrected within existing financial constraints.

I have no reason to imagine that the situation is any different in France or Denmark or Italy or, indeed, any of the candidate countries for membership of this Community. Our railways are wearing out; our need for them is tremendous. We must readjust the pattern of investment in the railway industry. The consequences otherwise will be catastrophic.

In conclusion, I shall quote against from the report of the House of Commons Transport Committee. It is a criticism of my own government, but it is one, I suspect, that can well be directed at any European government:

In our own view, the Government, although at least not proposing a substantial reduction in the level of invest-

## Cottrell

ment in the railways, have still, like their predecessors, failed to grasp the nettle of the problem of under-investment.

My report is about under-investment. It suggests that the Community should take a lead in directing the investment resources which are essential to the development of the railway network of the Community. We should not see it as a system of independent national networks. We should see it as a Community network which is able to serve this Community in what will inevitably be a worsening energy drought ahead. I know that the Commissioner, Mr Burke, will publish later this year his own report on railways and how he sees the development of railways taking place in this Community in the next decade or so. I do hope that he will at least take account of the proposals which I have put forward in this report. It is described as a response to integration. I do not actually think it is possible to integrate railways at this stage. What I do think it possible to do is exploit the advantages that railways offer, and this is what I commend to this House in my report.

**President.** — The proceedings will now be suspended until 9 p. m.

The House will rise.

*(The sitting was suspended at 8 p. m. and resumed at 9 p. m.)*

IN THE CHAIR: MR DE FERRANTI

*Vice-President*

**President.** — I call Mr Albers to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Albers.** — (NL) Mr President, I am speaking on behalf of my colleague Mr Gabert, who is unable to be here this evening. However, he sent me a note informing me that he is in complete agreement with the Cottrell report. Speaking as a fellow Socialist, I must also say that I find the report excellent and think it is unfortunate that the report by the Commission to the Council was only taken note of at the December 1979 plenary session. This can be expected to receive further attention in 1981 and it will be for the Dutch Presidency to take steps to this end. I shall very much welcome this since, as stated in the report, the railways should occupy a central position in Community transport policy. They are very economical from the point of view of energy consumption and can run on fuels other than the liquid fuels upon which we are so dependent, for example electricity or coal. Railways are also preferable from the environmental point of

view and offer a wide range of possibilities for combined transport.

Usually, when we think of combined transport we have in mind the idea of transporting large heavy loads over long distances by rail for subsequent delivery to specific destinations by road, in lorries. However, combined transport can also mean travellers going on holiday and wishing to travel great distances taking their cars with them on the train. One of my British friends, who is unfortunately also unable to be here this evening, told me that he intended to spend his holidays in Italy and would take advantage of this form of combined transport. Where then is the difficulty? Cooperation between the British and French railways would appear to be very poor and it is particularly difficult to obtain tickets for the necessary connections. This is not a simple business and this is therefore an area in which there is scope for improvement. In my view, the Commission should be able to take certain initiatives on this matter, which I will return to shortly.

Obviously, as the European Community expands and comes to include more countries, such as Greece, distances within the Community will become considerably bigger and, quite clearly, the railways will then be able to play a more important role over these increased distances. We all know how difficult it is to transport goods over the Alps through Austria or Switzerland. We know that here too it is possible to transport goods by rail in a way which is relatively harmless to the environment and economical on energy. However, having said all this in favour of the railways, we nevertheless find that rail transport accounts for a decreasing proportion of total goods traffic. This gives us food for thought, and if we refer to the report drawn up by my colleague Mr Seefeld, the current Chairman of the Committee on Transport, in 1979, we see that in this report, which received considerable support from the previous Parliament, he noted that no solution had been found to the deficits with which the railways in the various countries in the European Community had to contend. The report speaks of a dramatic failure in the policy of the Member States. In connection with social, financial and technical harmonization, the rapporteur noted in that report that it was perfectly possible to make progress in the right direction in small stages, but that with regard to rationalization policy for the railways what was needed was a single overall design.

The major difficulty facing us in connection with the railways is, as Mr Cottrell has already pointed out, the fact that the infrastructure is obsolete. Thus what we must do is substantially improve this infrastructure. However, if the major investment required is to be reflected in freight costs, and indeed passenger fares, then there will be such an increase in these costs and fares that the railways will again cease to be so attractive. Thus what we must do over the next few years is

## Albers

find solutions to this problem by means of a common approach and a common policy.

I might perhaps make one criticism of the report, namely that it devotes very little attention to the social aspect. Clearly, if the railways are to be integrated over the next few years, this could have considerable repercussions on the tens of thousands of people working in this sector. On a previous occasion I put a number of critical questions on this point, since I notice that there are a good twenty different committees which act in a consultative capacity regarding Community transport, including various committees advising on matters concerning the railways. For example, there is a Joint Consultative Committee on Social Questions which held no meetings whatsoever in 1978! None whatsoever, whereas it might be expected that a committee of this kind would meet fairly frequently. Perhaps the Commissioner can comment on this, since one would expect far more action in this field. Then there is the question of the extent to which we must think in terms of a form of cooperation, or to what extent we should try to find solutions by means of integration. It is essential always to find the best solutions. If it is possible to introduce provisional improvements by means of cooperation, then that will be the line to follow. However, our final aim must be to achieve greater integration.

If I may I should like to make a few additional comments. I myself get the impression that there is definite scope for improvement as regards trans-frontier rail transport, both for goods and for passengers. I should be pleased if the Commission to whom I addressed a number of questions on this point and received a somewhat disappointing answer, could take more action in this direction. As we all know, it is the frontier regions in particular that we find all sorts of gaps in the railways network which means that people must change trains, unnecessarily in my view, while there is also talk of closing certain lines which are the very ones which provide connections between the various Member States. In my view, there is certainly scope for improving passenger services.

I can assure you that the Socialist Group, which gives me its firm backing on this matter, will adopt a clear position regarding the railways. We intend to develop this still further. I am rapporteur for energy-saving in the transport sector and shall therefore definitely devote particular attention to rail transport in the report which I hope to bring out this autumn. We attach great importance to the development of rail transport, both for goods and for passengers. One of the reasons for this is safety, but what we really find disturbing is that we are wasting so much time. Considering that certain schemes were launched as far back as 1970 and considering how few results they have produced, we must now make use of the time available to us. This is something we should like to bring to the attention of the Commission. It is high time rail transport was developed and the infrastructure improved.

We therefore give our wholehearted support to Mr Cottrell's report, particularly as he states in his motion for a resolution that the Commission should report back to Parliament by the end of 1981 and not 'around 1985'. We in Parliament will be glad to do all we can, in consultation with the Commission, with a view to improving rail transport in the future.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Janssen van Raay to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

**Mr Janssen van Raay.** — Mr President, allow me on this special occasion to speak in English, in the first place to pay tribute to my friend and colleague Mr Richard Cottrell whom I want to compliment on his really enthusiastic report. As I said already in the Committee on Transport, until I became a member there I personally did not know much about the railways. On becoming a member, I became interested and, after reading his really very good report, I even became enthusiastic. I am more of an air traveller as some of you who were here this afternoon when we discussed Eurocontrol may know. But now I have become more informed about the advantages of the railway system. I am a firm believer, and I think my group is a firm believer, in competition and I think, on reading this report, that there is a good reason for the railways to compete against other modes of transport. The railways really — and reading this I am convinced — have a great future. One of my German friends gave me documents about recent experiments in Emsland in Northern Germany with a new type of train which can reach a speed of 400 km per hour with 196 passengers on a new magnetic monorail system. If our technology has the imagination and concern for competitiveness to invent this type of thing, the advantages Richard Cottrell mentioned in this report will be very tangible because one of the advantages of the railways which he mentioned is that it enables you to travel by night. All of us know that, because of environment problems, planes are no longer allowed, at least on the continent of Europe and maybe in England also, to fly during the night. Here you have a situation in which you can compete. The second advantage he pointed out is the ability to travel from city centre to city centre. You may think I am something of a Jekyll and Hyde because on one hand I am very enthusiastic about aeroplanes and on the other I really believe in a great future for the railways. This morning I said we could provide, as a directly-elected European Parliament, a new impetus for an integrated air traffic control system. I would add that the same goes for the railways. This is a new and enthusiastic endeavour to make the railways more competitive and financially attractive. We would ask the Commission to do some good background on this and my group of Christian Democrats fully supports

**Janssen van Raay**

this. I hope that when you read our proposed amendment, Mr Cottrell you will understand that they are meant to be constructive amendments, not negative ones. Some draft amendments are intended to completely reverse the proposals of the rapporteur. These are not. We seriously discussed the whole thing in my Group and we simply thought we could make one or two improvements. That was our opinion and we are very flexible on it. Tomorrow, when we vote on your report we shall hear your views. If you like our amendments, we shall move them. If you change your mind, we shall withdraw them. But anyway we like your report very much. We compliment you on it. My Group is very enthusiastic about it and I congratulate you on this really brilliant report.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Moorhouse to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Moorehouse.** — Mr President, I have three minutes in which to comment on this most important report. May I quickly say how much we have appreciated Mr Cottrell's effort in writing this report which we think is a very expert piece of writing. I should like to single out three or four, as it seems to me, particularly important points.

I think it is very timely that we should be looking at the future of railways. From an energy-saving point of view, there is little doubt that railways do score very markedly as compared with other forms of transport, but we shall be looking into this in close detail under Mr Albers and we did so much appreciate his contribution just now. A further advantage for railways, it would seem, is security of supply of basic fuel, insofar as all the indications point to electrification and of course, with electrification, one can turn to nuclear power as a source of that electricity or to hydropower or to coal. Then again on safety, I think we very often forget, underrate, the fact that railways are a very safe form of transport, compared particularly with the roads. For instance, in 1976, for every death occasioned by derailment or collision on the railways of the European Community there were no fewer than 1 292 fatalities on the roads. Certainly, a very big point in favour of the railways. Cooperation — Mr Albers mentioned the lack of cooperation apparently between the British Rail and the French railways. One is sorry indeed to hear that, but let us hope that with the coming into being of the Channel tunnel — it seems the right moment to mention the Channel tunnel in connection with cooperation — that this lack of liaison will be put right. What better example could there be than the Channel tunnel as a means of cooperation to link together 18 000 kms of highly-developed railway in the United Kingdom with the 88 000 kms of railways on the continent of Europe, so that — and this is very much a British point of view, of

course, but I think it one which would well be shared by the people on the Continent, — we can look forward to the day when passengers and freight can be sent by rail right the way through from the northern part of Scotland down to the tip of southern Italy and to Mr Buttafuoco's country. Indeed, we are looking forward to hearing Mr Buttafuoco speak about transport infrastructure, but just to come back to the Channel tunnel for a second, I think one really can see great benefits flowing from the building of the Channel tunnel, not only to the United Kingdom and to France, but also to the other countries in terms of the extra traffic which will be generated. So I hope you will gather, Mr President, from my all too brief remarks, that we strongly support Mr Cottrell's report and we look forward to the study by Mr Albers in the autumn.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Carossino to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

**Mr Carossino.** — *(I)* Mr President, the Commission's report to the Council on the long-term goals and on the way to bring about full or partial railway integration had a rather lukewarm reception from the Community circles involved, and gave rise to more criticism than support. That does not mean that Parliament should not make a statement on the Commission's proposals, which despite their limitations can be taken as a basis for discussion, given that they provide an outline of the problems which the railways are facing. The purpose of discussion would be to define the general aims at the heart of a plan to develop cooperation between the Community's railway undertakings in the wider context of building a Community transport system embracing all forms of transport, and in which the railways would assume their rightful role.

I spoke of cooperation, since it seems to be the only objective which can realistically be pursued in the medium term. Further progress towards railway integration, desirable though it may be, seems in the light of the reports we have of cooperation arrangements within the Community and of governments' stated intentions to be wishful thinking without even a slender chance of becoming reality.

We are convinced that progress through increased cooperation between railway undertakings within the framework of their present independent management is an essential step towards tackling the problem of partial railway integration. We unfortunately also have to admit there are still serious delays in promoting more effective coordination by Community bodies.

This lack of political will, this insistence on a national approach to the development of transport networks, is an obstacle to the construction of a coherent Commu-



## Carossino

nity transport system. We believe that an improvement in the railways' financial position and the establishment of goods and passenger services which meet the Community's present and future needs are essential both of the consolidation of the results we have achieved so far and to accomplishment of any further progress in the economic integration of the Nine.

The profound changes in transport needs over the past few years, and the difficulties which the railways have faced in adapting to the new requirements of the market, are due not to spontaneous factors but to the distorted competition provided by the choice of the motor car as the pacemaker of industrial development. This has led to considerable investment problems for the railways, because public funds available for transport have largely been invested in the development of the road transport infrastructure. That is why we consider it essential that the relationship between rail and road should, as I said, be balanced out in the context of an overall Community transport policy.

It should be added that the policy of railway development, if it takes place, is bound to have a positive influence on the overall economic development of the Community, since it will help both to solve the problems posed by industrial reconversion and to bring about an energy policy founded on energy-saving and on the diversification of energy sources.

There is therefore a lot the Community can do to make up for time lost. The document lists some general guidelines which we Italian Communists can agree with, both as regards the research to be undertaken to establish a long-term Community policy for the railways which takes into account the problems posed by the accession of new Member States, and as regards action to coordinate cooperation initiatives in the development of electrification and of inter-Community passenger services, in the improvement of the undertakings' commercial operating structure, easier frontier crossings, the promotion of combined transport techniques, and the planning and construction and improvement of the infrastructure with projects of Community interest.

As I have said, we are in broad agreement with these guidelines, since, if they are carried out, they will boost economic convergence throughout the Community and help overcome some of the worst sectoral and regional problems. We are in favour, too, because — as other Members have already said — railway transport fills a particular need today in a policy of proper management of natural resources and in the planning and organisation of economic and social development.

For these reasons we support Mr Cottrell's report and will vote in favour of the motion for resolution and of any improving amendments which are put forward, and we hope that after Parliament, the Council will adopt the report, so that it can become a directive for Community action in the transport sector.

**President.** — I call Mrs Le Roux.

**Mrs Le Roux.** — (*F*) Mr President, the opinion of the Committee on Transport and of its rapporteur, Mr Cottrell, on the Commission report on the European integration of railway undertakings does not surprise us. It is directly in keeping with the previous Commission plans for the long-term creation of a European railway company. But we have a right to wonder, and I do this on behalf of the French Communists and Allies, about the eagerness displayed here by Mr Cottrell and the majority of the Committee on Transport to implement a wicked plan.

Indeed, the reactionary and social-democratic majority of this committee wants to go even further, and even more quickly. It proposes to promote the coordinated management of railway investment and finance within the Community, including the funding of private projects. It proposes that the Commission take a special interest in the intra-Community goods transport sector. It mentions the need for railway undertakings to be financially balanced, forgetting any concept of public service.

In short, it proposes that the European authorities act selectively, favouring European goods trade and a few express trains for the use of European businessmen. This would lead inescapably to the disappearance of a whole part of the rail network, that of regions removed from the economic heart of the Europe of the multinationals, and that means most of the regions of my country, for instance the south-west, the Mediterranean, the centre, Brittany, and even the Paris area and the North of France. It will mean the disappearance of lines which irrigate the regional and rural fabric of our country, those stopping trains which are used by travellers of modest means and which make it possible to supply the smallest townships and districts without excessive energy consumption. By reducing the rail network to that part considered profitable according to the profit criteria of which we cannot approve, you will be paying the way for an even greater weakening of economic and regional life, for higher unemployment, for a Europe reduced to a few regions focused on the Federal Republic of Germany, for the draining of national wealth towards the Federal Republic and Benelux. The upgrading of the Dunkirk-Luxembourg line, which is being carried out mainly for the benefit of the Arbed company presages this.

Of course, cooperation on transport is necessary. Of course there is room for improvement. But it must also go beyond EEC frontiers. What you are proposing is not cooperation but submission. Once again these are projects which call into question the concept of public service and the life of the regions. Once again it is national independence which you want to sell out. The workers of France know the importance of the railway network. They do not hesitate to take numerous and

**Le Roux**

determined measures to defend the railways. Have no doubt that the projects will be received as they deserve by those who defend the life of my country. We will support their action and will begin by voting against your wicked proposals to integrate the railways.

**President.** — I call Mr Burke.

**Mr Burke, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, I would first of all like to join with those speakers who have congratulated Mr Cottrell on his report which examined with seriousness and indeed, if I might say so, personal commitment, our report on integration. Having had the opportunity of visiting him in Bristol and having seen him make a demonstration to me of railway problems in that area I know that he is personally involved.

I might also say that I am happy because I see a certain similarity between his approach and our own conclusions in the Commission. Perhaps I might tell the House that, over the three and a half years that I have held this mandate for transport, I have seen a certain development at different periods of different aspects of the transport policy. The whole shipping policy developed much more strongly, say, in the period 1977 onwards than at the beginning. It then fell to us to try and do something about aviation. We spoke about that earlier today and I indicated that our memorandum had given a lead on this question. We then thought it necessary to give a thrust in the direction of infrastructure, and we will come to that in the next report. Again, this is before the instances of the Community now for discussion and hopefully a decision.

Lastly, it seemed to me that railways needed to be given a thorough examination of a political nature, so as to give a new impulse to policies for the 1980s in this important sphere. I remember in May of 1978 a demonstration of railway unions in Brussels which was the biggest demonstration I have ever seen in my period there — bigger even than in agriculture. Ten thousand or so railway workers came to Brussels to indicate their concern about the future of their employment — about the future of railways — and I had the pleasure and indeed the privilege of receiving these railway unions at the very table of the Commission for a two-hour discussion. From that period it seemed to me important that at some early point we in the Commission should come forward with new proposals and new ideas. Therefore I welcome the emphasis that Mr Cottrell's report lays on action.

I am pleased to announce that, as a result of the impulse given at the time that I have mentioned and our discussions since then, we are currently preparing in the Commission a document on railway policy. This document, I hope, will interest a very wide sector of public opinion. In it I intend to review the current economic and financial situation of railways in the

Community, to undertake an evaluation of Community railway policy, and to consider the future outlook for this mode of transport, examining possible measures to overcome past difficulties and meet future requirements. The need to strengthen Community initiatives in the field of cooperation and integration, I am glad to say, will be noted in that document and has been particularly stressed here in Mr Cottrell's report. I hope that the Members of the European Parliament will continue to follow the ideas of this resolution by giving their full support to future Commission actions in this field.

Again, more specifically on the questions before us today, I intend later this year to present proposals which the Commission, under the provisions of Article 15(1) and 15(2) of the 1975 decision has to submit to the Council on fixing the time-limit and conditions for achieving the financial balance of railway undertakings and define more precisely the public service obligation to which railways may be subjected. I would like to indicate to Mrs Le Roux that there is no question whatsoever of disregarding the public service obligations of railways. The proposals which I have just indicated are an integral part of Community railway policy. They will be submitted to the Council and to Parliament once we have completed the policy review which, as I indicated to you a moment ago, is practically complete and will be published sometime in the autumn.

I, therefore, welcome the rapporteur's dynamism in this area and the contributions made by the various Members. I am aware, for example, of the connection between the use of this particular mode and the important question of energy-saving. I note also the emphasis laid by some speakers on social conditions in the railways and I take Mr Albers' point about the number of meetings of this committee. Perhaps, strangely, the reason why they may not have met so often may be due to the fact that — and I am very happy about this — workers in this area enjoy a relatively high level of remuneration, for example, by comparison with some other workers who, perhaps, may wish to meet more frequently to discuss these matters. Nevertheless, I note his point and I think it can be taken into account by all those who are involved. I want, also, to thank those people who have mentioned infrastructure. We have policies before the Council and Parliament on this important matter and they will be discussed very shortly by the House. A lot needs to be done in this area and I have spoken widely about the need to integrate, for example, the railway system of the continent of Europe with that of the United Kingdom. Again, this is something on which I look forward to some early progress. I am glad, for example, to see that the very distinguished academic, Sir Alec Cairncross, speaking to the Transport Committee of the British House of Commons, recently spoke favourably about possibilities in this area.

So, let us then move forward with the help of this dynamic report and let us take the memorandum on

Burke

railways which I am preparing and see if there is a political will in the Community to take the necessary legislative decisions; because after all, honourable Members of this House, there is only so much that a Commission can do. It can put forward initiatives for legislation — and we have done that, I think, in practically all the fields that I have discussed briefly here this evening. It remains for the Council of Ministers to legislate. And unless we get movement in that area, with the help of Parliament, then I am afraid a lot of our efforts will have been in vain. Nevertheless, I wish to thank the Parliament for its approach to these matters; to say that I have noted its willingness to help us to achieve a greater integration. I would not be too dogmatic, by the way, in making theological distinctions between cooperation and integration. What we really want to get is a greater utilization of the railway systems in the Community and we will work gradually towards that end.

I want to thank the House for its approach to this matter and to say that, as far as we in the Commission are concerned, we are pursuing these policies with all the energy possible and indeed are bringing forward new proposals in the very near future which should meet with the well expressed wishes of the Members of Parliament for this important mode of transport.

(Applause)

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

#### 14. *Projects of Community interest in transport infrastructure*

**President.** — The next item is the report drawn up by Mr Buttafuoco (Doc. 1-218/80) on behalf of the Committee on Transport on the

amendment to the proposal from the Commission to the Council for a regulation on support for projects of Community interest in transport infrastructure (Doc. 1-46/80).

I call Mr Buttafuoco.

**Mr Buttafuoco, rapporteur.** — (I) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, precisely because we are behind schedule, I decided not to speak on the Cottrell report, one of the reasons being that some of the points raised by my colleagues — in particular by Mr Albers, Mr Carossino and Mr Janssen van Raay — are shared by me. I say this simply to make clear our total agreement with Mr Cottrell's excellent report.

Mr President, a study of the documents produced by this institution shows, that interest in the subject

which this resolution deals with dates back to when the European Parliament had not yet been elected by universal suffrage. Previous Committees strongly supported the Commission's proposal of 5 July 1976, by way of a report by Mr Nyborg. They were convinced that a modern transport structure was one of the cornerstones of the economy and social policy of the Community and a decisive means of furthering unification.

If we look at our continent, we become aware that some of the gaps and distortions in the transport network are due to the frontiers which exist between countries, and this obviously offers wide scope for progress towards rationalization. Many transport barriers can be eliminated, barriers which sometimes — as Mr Mersch's report of 1974 so appropriately states — are worse than customs barriers, and relatively little expenditure could produce major results, ladies and gentlemen.

The European Parliament adopted a resolution on 4 July 1977, based on the report by Mr Nyborg which I have already mentioned, but the Council at that time — and since then — has not adopted any decision. On 18 February of this year the Commission — pursuant to the second paragraph of Article 149 of the EEC Treaty — submitted to the Council a modification to the proposal which the Council forwarded to Parliament on 21 March last, so that Parliament might deliver its opinion. The Proposal was referred to the Parliamentary Committee on Transport, which honoured me by choosing me as rapporteur. At its meeting of 30 May, the Committee examined the motion for a resolution and the explanatory statement and approved the motion unanimously, with only two abstentions. In fact, the Committee realized that the draft regulation was of prime importance for all our countries. The latter will naturally submit a whole range of projects, to which we expect recognition of their status as projects of Community interest will be accorded and to which we hope the Community will grant financial support necessary. This fact was stressed again at the meeting in Brussels last June and will be confirmed by the Klinkenberg report, which promises to be an interesting and probing study of the subject. The interest attached to the projects of great Community importance — projects such as the Channel tunnel or the bridge over the straits of Messina — is sure to be reiterated and no doubt this report will also take account of the waterway from Milan to the Adriatic, via Cremona, Mantua, Piacenza and Ferrara, which was shown to be necessary by the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Petronio and other Members of the Right.

Today the political will to modify the original draft regulation has become apparent, a will to modify it in such a way as to give preference to projects to be carried out in third countries for the benefit of the Community and, in particular, a project for a motorway link between Yugoslavia, Austria and Germany. It

**Buttafuoco**

is to be expected that the financial basis for this project will be provided by the Community with the aim of improving transport to and from Greece and to and from Italy, and that the Community will contribute to the financing of transport infrastructure in Austria and Switzerland with tunnels under the Alps. Examples are the construction of the Montecroce Carnico tunnel, which will link up with the motorway from Austria to Trieste, so that the region of Friuli/Venezia-Giulia is not cut off from the main stream of European traffic.

In my draft report approved by the Committee, I suggested two amendments. The first concerns the preamble and refers to paragraph 2 of Article 84, in order to enable measures to be carried out in the sectors of navigation and aviation as well. The second amendment, to Article 1, follows the same general line and takes account of the amendment which Mr Carosino did well to table to the draft regulation of the Council relating to support for projects of Community interest, and it is aimed at including in the above, ports and airports as infrastructures which qualify for financial aid from the Community.

When implementing this programme, ladies and gentlemen, we need to take account of two main factors — at least this is the Italian view and I think it may be shared by all of you. Firstly, the amount spent on projects to be carried out in third countries should not be excessively high in comparison with the sums which are aimed at the infrastructure of the Member States — at any rate, it should be kept within reasonable proportions — and above all the Community infrastructures should be more favourably treated as a result of the programme. Secondly, when choosing projects in the category of 'third countries', in order to qualify for the benefits which are provided for in the regulation, absolute priority will be given to the projects which concern routes which link two countries of the Community.

It is with these few points in mind that I invite Parliament to approve this amendment to the draft regulation.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Albers, on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Albers.** — (NL) Mr President, we are discussing a European transport network, an outline for a policy as described in Supplement 8/79, the Bulletin of the European Communities. This is an extremely important matter as it has become apparent that the Commission's original proposal for a regulation was in fact incomplete. Hence these additional proposals, since a European transport network can obviously not be exclusive to the Member States of the European Community. In view of the enlargement of the Euro-

pean Community, countries such as Austria, or Yugoslavia are closely involved in the development of this transport network. These are all problems which must be solved.

Naturally, it is vital that infrastructure projects in the interests of the Community should also be carried out within the European Community itself, for example, between Denmark and the Federal Republic, but as a Danish colleague told me today, it is a matter of extreme internal importance to Denmark that the islands forming part of its territory should be linked with the mainland. Clearly, this is a vast field which could be of enormous significance as regards employment too, which is one of the reasons why the Socialist Group can give its wholehearted support to these proposals.

However, I must make a few criticisms. I must say that I am very glad, now that this chamber is so full, that the members of the Committee on Budgets are also present. After all, what is the situation in which we currently find ourselves? The draft budget for 1981 was submitted to us today. This draft contains a large number of figures and percentages. It is obvious to all of us that the percentages for the agricultural policy are on the high side — in fact are far too high — and that the percentages for social and regional policy are on the low side, but even though poverty is extensive, the draft nevertheless gives 0.04 % or 0.024 %. However, the figures given for transport policy is not 0.00 %, since it is simply not possible to express the amount available for that sector as a percentage: 0.00! That is the situation as regards payment appropriations. If we now look at commitment appropriations we see the figure 0. This is followed by a dash because even a series of naughts are a little on the high side to indicate what we have to spare for transport policy in our Community.

I should like to draw your attention to this point, since if Parliament adopts the amendment we are discussing this evening, which I am sure it will, money will have to be forthcoming. According to a press cutting the Austrian Minister of Transport is calling a halt to the increase in transit by foreign lorries. This means barriers to transport and trade. If we wish to avoid these barriers being set up, it is not enough merely to come here and make fine-sounding speeches about what a good idea it would be to have a common policy, so that we could carry out projects of importance for the Community. Money must also be forthcoming. If the 50 million requested by the Commission last year for the 1980 budget, could now be made available for 1981 by means of a supplementary budget, this would represent 0.25 % of our total budget. I would be very glad for the Commissioner over there if that could be done this year.

Even if this money were now to be made available and if we were actually to find ourselves in a position to do those things which common sense tells us are neces-

**Albers**

sary, in spite of all the various political trends — and I am thinking particularly of the people behind me here, as I often hear very divergent views from these quarters — if only we could use our common sense and say, 'Yes, that's a good idea, this money must be made available, these projects are essential, this will be good for the development of transport, for the development of trade and for employment'.

Incidentally, in the Committee on Transport I had my personal objections to the amendments proposed by the rapporteur, but on further consideration I must admit, on behalf of my group, that we too think it is a good thing that air transport and ports should also be included since obviously if we want to improve the transport infrastructure, a development of air transport and, in particular, of the ports in the European Community is vital. Mr President, it will do doubt be obvious from what I have said that my Group gives its full support to the proposal by the Commission. We support the Buttafuoco report, and are also in favour of the amendments he has proposed.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Janssen van Raay to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

**Mr Janssen van Raay.** — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we support the Buttafuoco report. That is the first point I wish to make. Secondly, after all the debates on the Rules of Procedure and the protection of minorities, I should like to say as deputy coordinator of one of the larger groups that we find it perfectly natural that the 'non-registered' Members, if I may describe them in this way, should also be able to sit on committees and enjoy the same rights as all the other Members. Our Chairman, Mr Seefeld, has said right from the outset that it is perfectly natural for a non-attached member to act as rapporteur. I admire Mr Buttafuoco's modesty in being content with drawing up a report which originally merely appeared to concern amendments to details. What, however, has been his reward? Suddenly a new amendment has been proposed which is extremely interesting from the political point of view. This way by no means the original intention in that it concerned the question of Community financing of projects in, for example, Austria or Yugoslavia. But what has happened? We in the Committee on Transport have made known to the executive that we think the implementation of Article 84(2) should be taken very seriously, which means that the report has now taken on a far greater importance than had originally been intended. It is our wish that the Council should take the implementation of this Article seriously. This means that things have got moving. It is true that we have hesitated. We have been wondering whether or not it would be better to wait for the major report by one of our other

colleagues, but now we have taken the bull by the horns and indicated that we wish Article 84(2), which concerns maritime and air transport, put into practice. Both Mr Albers and myself are very much involved in transport problems and this question affects us too. The Commission, must, in my view, carry out a serious study of these points, since ports and sea and air transport are also of vital importance for Europe. For this reason we wholeheartedly support the Buttafuoco report, and particularly the proposed amendments it contains.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Moreland to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Moreland.** — Mr President, perhaps some of us from the western side of the Community might ask ourselves why we should use our hard-earned cash on roads, railways, waterways or ports in countries outside of the Community. The Select Committee on Transport of the British House of Commons has described this regulation as, and I quote, 'scarcely politic'. Well, why is it politic, and the answer of course lies in the map, because, as our German and Italian colleagues know, if you travel from Germany to Italy, you have to go through Austria. If you read the British Select Committee on Transport they do not actually appear altogether to understand geography and I am sure that my colleagues would appreciate it if the Commissioner were to send them a map of Europe. This is, of course, politic. Indeed, I am tempted to say that I look forward to the day when we are financing not just roads linking Germany and Italy through Austria or Greece and Italy through Yugoslavia, but perhaps the day when we can finance a road to Greece through Albania, because there is quite a lot of politics involved there as well.

I have so far been kind to the Commission but I now become a little bit more critical. Here I support warmly the amendment put forward by the committee. It does seem to me that free competition is a vital basis for the Community. One cannot have a regulation on infrastructure for some modes of transport and not for others. Roads, rail, air, sea are all important. Yet the Commission says in its green paper, and I quote:

The proposed action programme mainly concerns road, rail and waterway. Given the interrelationship between all modes of transport, some aspects of the role of ports and airports must be taken into account.

Some aspects, only some aspects Mr President? I should point out that if you travel from the United Kingdom or from Ireland or from much of Denmark to other parts of the Community, you have of course to travel at the moment by air or by sea at some points. Does the Commissioner for example disapprove of the recent investment by the European Investment Bank in

**Moreland**

Irish ferries? I cannot quite believe that he would have disapproved of the recent loan there. So consequently Mr President, to base this regulation solely on Article 75 of the Treaty of Rome, i.e. to limit it to inland surface transport, would be totally discriminatory. Therefore I entirely support the rapporteur on this matter.

Finally Mr President, much as I warmly welcome this motion, I have to give a warning and of course the warning came from Mr Albers. I have to give some words of warning, because, although I believe there is a strong Community interest in transport infrastructure and I believe that we must push the accelerator on the development of a common transport policy, there is one word and that is money. And frankly when I looked at that budget this morning I nearly wept when I saw what was in it for transport. The only occasion when I wept a bit more was when I looked at how much was in it for energy. And given that the President of the Commission in his speech in February made a great pitch on transport and energy, I thought why has the Commission not the guts to back him on this. And of course it is the big problem that we face because we do have to realize that spending is a matter of alternatives. We know that two governments at least oppose increases in our resources. We know that if we are to have money for an infrastructure programme, somewhere else has to lose. I know which part of the budget that I would like to see cut back. I was talking to a farmer the other day who was taking his milk to intervention and complaining about the roads and felt like saying to him *boni soit qui mal y pense*, because this of course is the problem. And we do realize that much as we support this regulation tonight there is spending involved behind it. I would like to see that spending but we have got to see spending cuts elsewhere to allow for it.

**President.** — I call Mr Maurice Martin, to speak on behalf of the Communist and Allies Group.

**Mr Martin.** — (F) Mr President, the French Communists are resolutely opposed the principle of Community intervention in transport infrastructure, for three reasons.

Firstly, we are told that there are bottlenecks in certain frontier zones. By definition this is a matter for bilateral decisions. It is up to the countries concerned to deal with these problems which, after all, do not create any special difficulties.

Secondly, the concept of Community interest in transport interests is used. What does that mean in reality? Care is taken not to define it, because in fact it means benefitting the dominant companies within the Europe of the Nine. On the pretext of establishing better links between peripheral areas, the intention is to increase centralization.

Thirdly, the pseudo-benefit to the Community is in obvious contradiction to national sovereignty, which implies national control over transport infrastructures and over the general balance of networks.

Let me add that France is particularly affected in this matter. In view of its central position and its geography, France would be particularly badly hit by this policy. In fact, the procedure proposed by the Commission consists in promoting the financing of links of so-called 'Community interest', which is bound to mean unfavourable treatment for the others. Now if France is crossed by several links of international interest, a large part of the country would still find itself left out.

Your policy would lead to a structural distortion of the regional organization of France. A Community transport policy would divide our country in two, with one part linked to the outside and the other forming a neglected and underequipped interior. This is unacceptable and we reject it categorically. Let me add that in the case of France, links of international interest and links of national interest are not necessarily identical. We say this with all the more conviction since we have already had experience of such a disastrous policy. Thus, for example, the eastern motorway, intended to link Paris and Strasbourg, was diverted north to improve the connections with the Saar and the Ruhr.

The result is deplorable. It is a flagrant economic failure. We will not accept the introduction of this absurd procedure on a general scale. The principle objective of transport infrastructure is to ensure a fair balanced between modes of transport and regions within the national territory. The kind of European integration proposed here would be diametrically opposed to this. We refuse a course leading to a two-tier France, just as some people speak of a two-tier economy. Anyone who accepted this policy would be guilty of delivering a serious blow to national unity.

**President.** — I call Mr Carossino.

**Mr Carossino.** — (I) Mr President, the Commission's proposal to widen the scope of support offered by the Community to transport infrastructure sectors so as to include projects which may be carried out in third countries is a proposal which definitely deserves to be examined from several view points.

The first and major comment concerns the contradiction likely to occur between this proposal for increasing the scope of intervention outside the Community, and proposals by one or two national delegations which aimed at restricting the sphere of action of the draft regulation and thus removing any coherence it might have had. In fact, we consider that all direct intervention by the Community in transport infra-

## Carossino

structure sectors, to be welcomed from all points of view, should above all overall policy. Other members have already stated this in fact in their speeches a short time ago. The idea is it should include all modes of transport in order to start the albeit gradual movement towards the setting up of a Community regulatory transport system. Instead of this, as everyone here knows, the Council has approved a decision concerning the instituting of a consultation procedure and the setting up of a Committee on Transport Infrastructures which will exclude airports and seaports. The Council has thereby completely ignored the vote of the European Parliament which demonstrated its support for an overall policy along these lines.

Now, the Committee on Transport of our Parliament once more proposes to include navigation and aviation infrastructures in the programme. We think that the Council's approval of this proposal is an essential prerequisite for us to be able to accede the request to extend intervention to cover non-member countries.

The motives behind these demands are quite clear. Apart from the need which we have already mentioned to achieve well-balances and harmonious development of all modes of transport, we should also like to stress the importance of ports, which are the links in the chain between sea transport and land transport, and through which the majority of the raw materials imported into the Community and of manufactured goods which the countries of the Community export all over the world must pass. And we must also take into consideration the imminent enlargement of the Community to include Greece and in the years to come Spain and Portugal, and finally — as other speakers have already stated — the energy crisis situation which has boosted the role of railways and sea transport for the very reason that they consume less energy.

In the Committee's memorandum on the role of the Community in the development of infrastructures, it was correctly pointed out that action in this sector should in future occupy a large place in Common Transport Policy. But if the Council approves the regulation relating to financial support, this would introduce into Community policy an instrument which is in fact new because a proportion of the expenditure needed to carry out these projects of Community interest would have to be systematically laid off against the Community budget. I mean projects which if they were not carried out would tend to create a bottleneck in the traffic between the Member States.

Nonetheless, we wonder if the Council has the real political will to institute an intervention of this sort and we have more than one reason to think it does not in view of the fact, already mentioned here, that in the 1980 budget the modest sum which we proposed to allocate to this policy was removed. Now we think that the scale of expenditure as well as the defining of strict criteria for distribution of funds in order to

support specific projects form another basic prerequisite on which it would be advisable for our Parliament to give its opinion before deciding if the Community should for example help to a lesser or greater extent in financing the Austrian road. It would be advisable to establish the precise circumstances under which non-member countries might qualify for the planned aid, for example by setting a limit, a maximum percentage in relation to the size of the total sum available, and ensuring that absolute priority is given to transit routes which link two countries of the Community. In this way we could avoid seeing Community funds accorded to non-member countries increase the isolation of certain economic areas, for example north-west Italy or north-east Italy when compared with the centre of Europe and with a part of the south of Europe, instead of improving the links within the Community. In conclusion, we consider that the approval of these committee proposals is the essential first step towards the adoption of the whole measure and to ensure that it is endowed with the force and impact of a new Community instrument for the transport policy we wish to have.

**President.** — I call Mr Turner.

**Mr Turner.** — Mr President, I must say first of all that I entirely agree with my friend, Mr Moreland, in what he said about the House of Commons Select Committee on Transport — they are pathetic. Their reaction is that of what the Victorians used to call a one-horse village — one might call them a one-horse select committee.

Now I want to come on to the question of ports. It is futile to consider transport infrastructure without ports. Many rail and road communications lead to ports. For instance, to build a road from the English Midlands to the Ruhr without making port extensions in East Anglia and Rotterdam would be economic nonsense. This came out very clearly when Mr Murke had his colloquium in Brussels recently where ports, I believe, were talked about more than almost anything else. He has spoken widely all over the Community and has done a great deal of good, and I think he can only conclude from what he has seen on his travels round the Community that ports are an essential part of the EEC.

Indeed his Green Paper is based upon the importance of bottlenecks, and bottleneck, I think, means slowing down. At least I notice that is what happens when one goes through a bottleneck, and a port is something by which one is inevitably slowed down. There is no question about it, ports slow you down. Ports are bottlenecks. If we had roads going straight from the Midlands to the Ruhr the traffic would get there sooner, and so I conclude as a matter of logic that ports are the real bottlenecks. The Commissioner's

## Turner

Green Paper was designed to prevent bottlenecks, and the ports of East Anglia are potential bottlenecks.

To exclude ports would be a gross geographical discrimination. The EEC has grown a good deal since Sicily became part of it in 1957, and I believe that ports are no more than an extension of rail and road facilities right up to the time when the freight gets on board the ship. I don't want to quibble, because I am not really a lawyer, or at least a very good lawyer, but if one were to quibble, one could say that a port is governed by the terms of Article 75 and Article 84 (1) of the EEC Treaty until you come to dredge the water, and I think we can pay for dredging our own waters, Mr Commissioner. I only want money for the infrastructure up to the port-side itself.

I believe there is no real constitutional point here at all. There is no legal difference between rail and road on the one hand and the port-head on the other, leaving aside the question of the dredging of the water. For instance, do you call roll-on and roll-off transport land transport or sea transport? Is the Channel tunnel, with its rail and road links, classed as land or sea? One cannot tell. The matter is quite unimportant economically and technically, as has been recognized by this Parliament. Everybody who has spoken here has said so. Mr Burke himself also acknowledged this when he recently visited Felixstowe, Ipswich and Harwich and saw and studied the rail and road developments going on in these ports. Now, ports in general fall within his ambit, and I trust that he will make use of all his powers to help the development of all bottlenecks or suspected bottlenecks in the EEC. I would very modestly commend to him one particular one, and that is, of course, the ports of East Anglia.

**President.** — I call Mr Burke.

**Mr Burke, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, those who wish to understand the Commission's general policy on infrastructure should consult the memorandum produced in November 1979 and the various speeches made both in this House and elsewhere up to and including the colloquium held on 6 June in Brussels. I shall therefore confine myself for the most part to the amendment to the original Financial Regulation which I have proposed in the relatively recent past.

I should like very much to thank the rapporteur for his excellent report. Needless to say, the Commission attaches great importance to this extension of the Financial Regulation to cover projects located on the territory of non-Member countries. This extension has particular importance in view of the forthcoming accession of Greece. A case which springs immediately to mind in relation to this amendment is that of the Austrian Government's request for aid to overcome the serious problems caused by transit traffic on the

*Gastarbeiter* route, of which 90 % travels to or from the Community. Of course, as many speakers have pointed out, one could also make a case for the improvement of rail links between Germany and Italy and so on. The Committee on Transport thinks it advisable also to take this opportunity of including ports and airports in the field of application of the regulation.

Now, the Commission was not unaware of this question when it approved its memorandum in November of last year on the role of the Community in the development of transport infrastructure. Members of the Committee on Transport and Members of the House will know that this is a delicate problem. I should like to pose the question of whether or not we should take a further step and include ports and airports, basing ourselves on Article 84 (2). I would point out that during the discussions on the proposal for a decision instituting a consultation procedure, we noted that the majority of Member States were hostile to the inclusion of ports and airports, and I think it is important at the present stage to avoid creating more difficulties for the discussions on the proposal for a financial aid regulation. I would also like to draw your attention to the fact that if aid to ports and airports is accepted, a modification to the consultation procedure will be essential. I suggest to you that to propose such a modification would be risky. The consultation procedure and the Transport Infrastructure Committee which we have now got constitute a valuable step forward for the Community, and it would be, in my judgement, hazardous to reopen the discussion on any aspect of it. Consequently, I ask Parliament to accept that at this first stage the changes should be limited to those corresponding to the specific object of our proposal, that is, the extension of the field of application of the Financial Regulation to projects of special interest to the Community and located on the territory of non-Member States. Therefore, the purpose of these amendments — and there is only one amendment to Article 1 and a consequential amendment to one of the recitals — is to deal with the specific problem which I am bringing before the House.

I will not go any further into a discussion of the advisability of changing to Article 84 (2), other than to say that when you take into account that infrastructure for the inland modes in ports takes up to, let us say, 70 % of the available funds for these projects, I would venture to say that the substantial part of the expenditure on ports is already potentially included in the present regulation. I have noted what Mr Turner has said, but I shall not at this stage pronounce on the point he has made. I would therefore ask you to accept the draft amendment which I have put forward and not to lose any opportunity in the immediate future of seeking to push forward the acceptance of the overall infrastructure policy.

I shall conclude by drawing the attention of the House — and here I am trying to reply to Mr Alber's ques-



**Burke**

tion about money — to the statement made by Mr Tugendhat in regard to the draft budget for 1981. He explained clearly the Commission's view of the reasons for which it was not possible at this stage to put money aside for transport infrastructure. As a Member of the Commission, I accept that to be the case. It is not the intention of the Commission, in so doing, to under-emphasize or de-emphasize in any way, the importance of transport infrastructure, but I shall look forward to the day when it is possible to have amounts of money set aside in the budget for these important purposes. The key, of course, is the adoption of the financial-aid regulation by the Council of Ministers and, let us hope, the adoption by them of this consequential amendment, which stems from the Austrian Government's request and, indeed, from its desirability in itself. The solution to our problems in regard to money really lies with that body in our Community institutions which has the power to adopt the legislation. I have personally done all I can in this matter at this point. It is now over, as in so many matters in transport, to the Council of Ministers.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

#### 18. *Implementation of the 1979 budget*

**President.** — The next item on the agenda is the report (Doc. 1-275/80) drawn up by Mr Aigner, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the implementation of the 1979 budget (Doc. 1-76/80).

I call Mr Aigner.

**Mr. Aigner, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, first of all I should like to address a word of appreciation to the Commission. It's a pity that Mr Burke is just leaving; I wanted to say that the presence of three Commissioners here at so late an hour represent a larger percentage than Parliament can muster up at the same hour. Since we so often criticize the Commission, I feel that a word of praise is called for here.

Mr President, it is my task on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control to lay before you and explain a motion for a resolution which is basically aimed at three interlocutors: firstly, the parliamentary committees concerned by this motion; secondly, the Commission, with a specific request that it should reassume its role as the executive body of the European Community, and thirdly, the Council — even if it is only symbolically represented here — with the request that above all it should no longer ignore Parliament's budgetary rights.

The main problem in our parliamentary work is that the political will which the European Parliament expresses in its majority decisions is very often — and in view of the 1979 report I am bound to say in most cases — not carried out and indeed is very often actively opposed, by the executive bodies of the European Community. This is equally true for the so-called European Summit. This, by the way Mr President, is an expression which is better suited to midgets than to our Heads of State. A Parliament which in four years' time has once more to appeal to its electors for votes can only expect to have the voters' confidence if it has made a credible job of tackling at least the following tasks.

Firstly, Parliament must have subjected the Commission to political control, and this also means repelling the Council's ever encroaching omnipotence and defending the Commission's legal position as laid down in the Treaties.

Secondly, it must be made possible for the European Parliament's budgetary rights, which were once described as Parliament's quintessential rights, to be converted into definite political action according to Parliament's political will as expressed by a majority of its Members. The Commission, as the executive body, should be forced to carry out the political will of Parliament expressed by majority vote, if need be by the threat of a motion of censure and of dismissal. The Commission cannot and should not use the Council's behaviour in contravention of the Treaties as an excuse for its own inaction.

Thirdly, there is no doubt that the Community's crisis is an institutional one. The enlargement of the Community will not only highlight this crisis but also if there are no changes, lead to a catastrophe. Even at this stage, the European Parliament should envisage constitutional solutions when it comes to putting forward its claim to recognition as a policy-making body. Budgetary rights as expressed in the new financial treaties of Luxembourg are in fact a classic example of this. The Council and the European Parliament have an equal share in the political responsibility for the budget. This is, however, the first step towards a so-called two-tier system, in which decisions and control are the province of both a body made up of the various nationalities and a European Parliament, and it is a different organ, i.e. the Commission, which under this control sees to the implementation of this political will.

Mr President, the report which your Budgetary Control Committee puts before you today is not intended to supplant the debate on a discharge for the Commission — that discussion will be taking place in the coming year on the basis of the annual report of the Court of Auditors. The report before you now is based in particular on the Commission report of 31 December 1979 which bears the title 'Financial situation of the Communities'.

**Aigner**

Mr President, in paragraph 5 of the motion for a resolution we ask above all that the appropriate committees — and our motion is really aimed in the first place at our specialist committees, that is the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, the Committee on Regional Policy and Regional Planning, the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, the Committee on Energy and Research and the Committee on Agriculture — to analyse more closely the lack of implementation of their budgetary proposals within the various fund and, within the framework of the coming budgetary procedure, to provide for solutions to assist the Commission in eliminating these shortcomings, and at the same time to put forward proposals for new resources with corresponding guidelines to enable the Commission to succeed in (even if the Council refuses to cooperate) carrying out the proposed policies.

Mr President, all the committees in our Parliament should get in touch with the corresponding committees in the national Parliaments via the rapporteurs concerned, in order to stop the Council from pursuing its policy of destruction. I believe that it has now become clear to even the most casual observer that the Council is in fact no longer a Community institution, but only a sort of clearing house for national interests, which by using the principle of unanimity prevents any further progress of the European Community. But the Council itself must recognize that the political will of Parliament can, if necessary, effectively change the Treaties in such a way that the European Community will once more become viable. The conflict between the institutions is not only a legal problem, but also a problem of political will and courage. And the Council must be increasingly obliged to defend its powers before the European Court of Justice, so that it may be fully exposed to public scrutiny and thereby gain public acceptance.

Mr President, in the final analysis this report by the Committee on Budgetary Control should also show the Commission that Parliament is no longer willing simply to accept that the Commission should give the same old explanation every year at least with regard to 90 % of the new policies put forward by the European Parliament, i.e. that at most only some ten or twenty percent of payment appropriations have been spent; that commitment appropriations could not be used because of a lack of cooperation from the Council or from the Member States; that the appropriations would have to be carried over in full to the following year; that the new policies could not be dealt with yet.

Mr President, for the details I should like to refer you to my report, both to the explanatory statement and to the motion for a resolution. However, all our parliamentary committees should be aware that progress towards achieving budgetary powers for the European Parliament lies not only within the competence of the Committee on Budgets and the Committee on Budgetary Control, but also and above all in the hard political

work of our specialist committees. This is why the report of the Committee on Budgetary Control is above all aimed at stimulating the activity and political courage of the specialist committees in this House.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Tugendhat.

**Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, I am grateful to you for calling me to speak immediately after Mr Aigner for a reason that will become apparent in a short time. Before getting involved in what I have to say, I would like to thank him very much for the kind remarks he made about the presence of the Commission at the beginning of his speech. I am grateful to him for recognizing the presence here of the Commission.

Unfortunately, however, I shall disagree with him on a great many other things thereafter. For us, there are a number of points of principle involved in the report and in what he had to say, which is why I wanted to get them on the record immediately after his speech.

First of all, I should like to make the point — it is well-known to Mr Aigner — that the control exercised by Parliament over the Commission's management is exercised pursuant to Article 206 b of the EEC Treaty, relating to the decision giving a discharge. There are several stages in the procedure that is applicable here, and it is worth recapitulating them here.

Under Articles 67, 73 and 75 of the Financial Regulation, the Commission is required to prepare by 1 June each year a revenue and expenditure account, a balance sheet and an analysis of its financial management over the past financial year. These documents serve as a basis for the Report that Article 206 a of the Treaty requires the Court of Auditors to prepare. Each institution then replies to the points made in the Report, and the replies are published in the Official Journal.

At the preparatory stages preceding the discharge decision, Parliament's specialized committees and Committee on Budgetary Control examine these various documents and draw up a final report on which Parliament is asked to vote.

It must be emphasized that, at each of these stages, the Commission can answer questions and provide explanations so as to justify its management activities if necessary. But the situation we have today reserves this procedure, since criticisms are being levelled in advance, even before the first stage of the procedure, without the Commission being given the opportunity to make use of such facilities as are available to it at the various stages of the procedure. In other words, we are basically being found guilty before we have a

### Tugendhat

chance to prove ourselves innocent. The principle of justice is that a man is innocent until he is found guilty and not the other way around.

What is more, it was agreed in the course of the 1978 discharge procedure, at the suggestion of Mr Aigner himself and of the Committee on Budgetary Control, that the specialized committees would henceforth be fully involved in the procedure. And yet today a decision is to be taken without them. They are even being asked to act in terms that appear to imply a criticism of them. They are being told what to do, and the procedure lays down what they have to do, but because it is all happening in a premature fashion they do not have a chance to do it.

The motion for a Resolution further alleges that the Commission has not provided adequate information on the difficulties it has met. That too is a serious allegation.

As I have already had occasion to say, the Financial Regulation requires the Commission to produce a quarterly report on the financial situation. While it is true that the distribution of these reports is a time-consuming process which we are trying to speed up, it is just not true that the Commission has failed to inform Parliament of the difficulties it has encountered.

Much attention has indeed been paid to these difficulties since last September, throughout the procedure for establishing the 1980 Budget and on the occasion of the Oral Question by Mr Notenboom concerning implementation of the budget in the first half of the year. Parliament's specialized committees have all had opportunities to discuss the degree of utilization of appropriations with the Members of the Commission directly concerned. Wide-ranging exchanges of views have consequently been possible, and any shortcomings or difficulties have been brought to light. It follows that the allegation that Parliament has not been properly informed is clearly unfounded.

Having dealt with these matters of principle, I should like to go on to discuss a number of points of detail.

Very often it is the Member States who are to blame if appropriations for payment have not been used, or have been used inadequately. This chiefly concerns payments from the ERDF, the Social Fund and the EAGGF Guidance Section. As regards certain appropriations for measures to benefit certain non-member countries, it is a well-known fact that inadequate reception structures in the recipient countries are sometimes to blame for delays in implementation. In other cases, the reason is that there are no regulations to provide a legal basis for expenditure, a point to which Mr Burke referred a few moments ago. Two shining examples are the appropriations at Item 3750 (Community industrial reorganization and redevelopment operations) and the nonquota section of the

ERDF. Mr Davignon, Mr Giolitti and myself have both repeatedly spoken to you about this.

The idea that the blame for failure to implement these appropriations lies with the Commission, as alleged at point 3 (a) of the Motion for a Resolution, is therefore untenable. I am not suggesting that the Commission is blameless, but the allegation that the fault is the Commission's is untenable. There have been improvements, some of them substantial, in the implementation of appropriations as compared with 1978. There has been a general, and in many cases substantial, increase in the rate of utilization of appropriations for commitment.

While the picture is not quite so bright regarding payments, there have still been a number of significant improvements, particularly in relation to the three structural funds, where great efforts have been made.

Lastly, on this point let me draw particular attention to the position regarding two of these funds: in 1979, the rate of utilization of appropriations for commitment was 94 % for the Social Fund and 100 % for the quota section of the Regional Fund.

I have a special word to say about the criticisms made regarding the utilization of appropriations for financing individual projects under the EAGGF Guidance Section. As your Committee is aware, these projects are selected and implemented under the responsibility of the Member States, following a Commission decision concerning them. Incidentally, a large number of projects are concentrated on a small number of countries.

The situation at the moment is that 250 projects were presented with incomplete information; this meant that additional information had to be obtained as the regulations require and the procedure was held up correspondingly. I really cannot believe that Parliament intends to encourage the Commission to make payments without carrying out all the necessary checks.

We really are in a most astonishing situation where we have the Control Committee cracking a whip over us to get out and spend money, and yet they would be the first people to criticize us — and rightly so — if it turned out that we had been spending without due regard to the regulations. It does seem to me that where public money is concerned it is better to err on the side of caution than on the side of largesse. And I cannot think of any control committee in any Member State that puts the speed of payment ahead of carefulness, and I am sure it is not the intention of this committee to do so either. But the impression one gets from the way in which the report is written is that speed is of the essence and that, I think, is not what the committee can want and not what should be the case either.

**Tugendhat**

Finally, Mr President, I would like to conclude by emphasizing two points.

The Parliament is planning to exercise its powers in relation to the Commission and it is only right and proper that it should do so. As a supporter of parliamentary democracy in general, and of the European Parliament in particular, I emphasize that point. But in cases where the Commission is not to blame — either because it has no power to take action or because the implementation of the budget item depends on action by a Member State — criticizing the Commission rather than the Council or the Member State is counter-productive, as well as unjust.

Secondly, the fact that the analysis made of the way the budget was implemented highlights only the shortcomings is going to give an erroneous picture of the policies pursued by the Community. The vital source of equilibrium, that is to say the large number of successes that have been achieved, many of them in difficult circumstances, is completely overlooked. In many cases, we are, of course, acting as a result of prompting, criticism and exhortation from the Parliament. But those advances and improvements are overlooked. I am sure that that omission is involuntary, but at any rate the consequence of dealing only with the shortcomings, and never with the improvements, is certainly going to weaken the Commission's position as seen both by public opinion and by the Council and Member States.

If I might here refer, as one or two of my compatriots were doing earlier, to the House of Commons, we have seen a select committee produce a report which contains a number of rather tendentious statements which arise entirely from the fact that Community institutions themselves have concentrated only on the shortcomings and not upon any of the advances.

I would like to finish, Mr President, by saying that I felt it necessary to reply at this length, despite the lateness of the hour, and in this detail from a prepared text because the Commission does take very seriously indeed the work of the Parliament, the work of the Control Committee and the rules and regulations that have been set up to govern the conduct of affairs. I do believe that it is in the best interests of all the institutions concerned that the rules and the procedures should be maintained and that reversing them in this way is really not a very satisfactory way to begin. I am sorry if it means that from time to time, late at night, I have to make speeches which are couched in strong language — albeit to an empty House — but it is because I do take terribly seriously the work of the committee and, therefore, when the committee makes allegations, it is necessary for me to make a full and detailed reply. Otherwise, only the criticisms are on the record and not our replies.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Colla to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Colla.** — *(NL)* Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I shall be brief.

We should, I think, latch on to any available chance to make the implementation of the budget and budgetary control more efficient and up-to-date in future. The analyses of its financial management which the Commission draws up every few months form, I think, a good basis. However, if we are to be able to keep track of this control, a number of conditions must, I think, first of all be fulfilled, starting with a revamping of the document currently before us, which formed the basis of the Aigner report. This has already been discussed in the Committee on Budgetary Control. On the one hand, the document covers too much ground while on the other hand it is not detailed enough. I do not wish to level any particular criticisms in this respect this evening, but I think both the Commission and the Committee on Budgetary Control should put their heads together to look into the question of how these documents could be drawn up in a more rational and efficient manner, with a view to making control more efficient and avoiding unnecessary criticisms.

Secondly — as Mr Aigner has already mentioned — this Parliament must adapt its working methods and, in particular, our 'specialized committees' should be more closely involved in budgetary control.

Thirdly — and I broadly-speaking share the Commission's views on this point — the control procedure as it is currently carried out is I think, somewhat questionable. I realize that it is by no means the intention of the rapporteur to call into question the official discharge procedure — indeed he has just reaffirmed it. However, if this approach is maintained, we will come up against the same difficulty every year and I should like, on behalf of my group, to repeat the proposal I made this afternoon to the effect that this debate should be conducted as if it was in the course of an oral question with debate, so that we can make our observations straight away and the Commission will be able to reply to them. That would be the beginning of the official discharge procedure under which I should also like to hear what the Court of Auditors had to say about the 1979 financial year.

This by way of introduction. I should now like to go into a few further points. If we study the Commission's financial report, it is once again clear that we cannot be all that satisfied with the general situation as regards utilization. I should like to give a few examples. As regards those appropriations which are not divided into tranches, the rate of utilization of title 3 of the budget has not yet reached 40 %, while in the case of those appropriations which are divided up, barely 40 % of the payment appropriations have been utilized.

## Colla

Secondly, we see once more that there has been extensive carry-over of appropriations, which is not so bad in itself as this is not a question of lost appropriations, but is nevertheless an indication that something is wrong as regards the implementation of the budget. The carry-overs involve amounts in excess of 630 million EUA, with payment appropriations of around 1 000 million carried over from 1979 to 1980. These are by no means insignificant amounts!

That is the situation so far as regards carry-overs, but what in fact bothers me even more is what I might call the missed opportunities, by which I mean actual cancellations, since these are appropriations which are lost. In the case of commitment appropriations, the cancellations amount to approximately 150 million EUA and the figure is approaching 20 million EUA in the case of payment appropriations. These are amounts which had already been carried over from 1978 and which have not been fully utilized. I think it is important that attention should be drawn to these figures, but not because, as the Commissioner implied, I am in favour of the money simply being spent even if the files are not in order. I do not think we should fall into that trap — by no means. However, it is particularly unfortunate in view of the social and economic crisis within the Community that we have failed in a number of areas to find ways of utilizing the available appropriations in a serious manner. This is not intended as an attack on the Commission or anyone else, I am quite simply pointing out that everyone is shouting from the rooftops that a great deal needs to be done in all sorts of areas, whereas it nevertheless appears impossible to make sensible use of a number of appropriations. We must all, I think, get together and try and find out why this should be so, as this is a contradiction to which a solution must be found.

I should like to illustrate this point with three examples. Let us take the energy sector. At first sight, the situation appears to have improved somewhat since 1978. However, the state of affairs is still until 1978 the necessary legal basis was lacking in to a considerable extent unsatisfactory. I know that a number of important sectors I am thinking, for example, of alternative energy sources — but as regards the energy crisis, which is constantly on everybody's lips, the situation is still unsatisfactory.

My second example concerns the Social Fund. There has clearly been a marked improvement in the situation as regards payment appropriations. New initiatives have been taken. I am thinking, for example, of chapter 53 which concerns promoting employment for young people, particularly those under 25. This is a good thing, but overall the situation in this field too is still unsatisfactory.

In 1979, the extent of utilization of the non-quota section of the Regional Fund was nil. We know why, but the fact nevertheless remains. As far as the quota section is concerned, there was in fact an improvement

as regards the payment appropriations. However, the overall utilization rate was only 60-61 %.

We must, at any rate, take any opportunity we can to look into the basic reasons for this unsatisfactory situation. . .

**Mr Aigner.** — (D) This is far too long!

**Mr Colla.** — (NL) . . . Yes, Mr Aigner, but if I were to work out how much time we spend listening to you in the Committee on Budgetary Control — not, of course, without interest — I am sure in most cases it would be much longer than my speaking time, and I have never on any occasion expressed any irritation at this. I hope, however, that your reaction just now was due merely to the lateness of the hour.

We must, I think, also look into what the Commission has done in the meantime, on the basis of the supplementary report which Mr Battersby has promised to draw up for the second half of the year. We must pay constant attention to the overestimations in the budget, and particularly to the gap between the budget on the one hand and the necessary legal basis on the other. Above all, we must urge the Commission to take more initiative in this respect. Finally, the various responsibilities must be made clear once more and I should like to repeat what I have said before on this matter, namely that the Commission is indeed responsible but the Member States also have particular responsibilities in this matter, as does the Council. I hope that the rapporteur has not found my contribution to the debate too long and should like, at any rate, to thank him for his attention.

**President.** — I call Mr Irmer to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mr Irmer.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the way in which Mr Tugendhat's reaction just now, which I feel was dismayed, even touchy, shows most clearly how important the instrument of budgetary control in this Parliament is. It is indeed true that on close examination Parliament's budgetary Powers would be of little use were they not complemented by budgetary control powers and their associated sanctions. The quarterly reports should also give Parliament an opportunity, quite independently of any debate on discharge, to examine and elucidate the way in which the Commission has conducted its financial operations and implemented the budget. You, Mr Tugendhat, have just stated that the procedure which we have chosen to use here is not explicitly laid down in the Treaties, but I feel that you should get used to this Parliament claiming the right to do anything which it has not been explicitly forbidden to do, and nowhere in the Treaties does it state that we should

**Irmer**

not use the procedure which we have chosen here. I feel that this procedure is absolutely essential before we enter into discussions on the budget for 1981, for how can the committees of this Parliament table proposed modifications or draft amendments if they do not know how the policy which Parliament adopted in their particular sphere for the previous budgetary years has been carried out. I am very concerned about what is going on here. You say that the Commission is not guilty. It was not our intention to apportion guilt to anyone here. I believe that all the institutions should be interested in helping the Community to progress and in putting into effect the policies which are jointly felt to be necessary. In order to do this, we need this control instrument, because we do not want to decide one year to spend money for specific projects to which we wish to give special emphasis, only to discover a year later that — for whatever reason — yet again nothing has been done. We want to help the Commission when it is in difficulties with the various Member States. And then we must consider how better to ensure that funds are actually used.

But we want to have you on our side in our institutional conflict with the Council of Ministers. No-one here is asking you to spend money pointlessly and contrary to existing provisions. But whenever money can be usefully spent, we do not want you simply to ignore existing legal provisions, one of which happens to be the budget drawn up by this Parliament as part of the budgetary authority. In my opinion it will simply not do, when regulations are being passed, for the political will of this Parliament, the legal act of the budget, to be disregarded as a result of the Council's inertia. And yet that is what is happening. We already put our finger on this during the debates on a discharge for the 1977 and 1978 budgets.

My speaking time is now at an end and therefore I should just like to say that we shall continue to follow this line of argument during the debate on a discharge for the 1979 budget. We will do so constructively, but with the utmost determination and firmness in order to impose our point of view, and I said this in the first place when I was newly appointed as rapporteur for the discharge for the 1979 budget. I therefore look forward to successful cooperation during the examination of the Commission's work. There will certainly be a lot of matters to settle in committee.

**President.** — I call Mr Aigner.

**Mr Aigner, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, please allow me to make a few further remarks.

Firstly, Mr Colla, may I remind you that his report with the explanatory statement and the motion for a resolution was unanimously passed — that means that

you voted in favour too — in the Committee on Budgetary Control. It may be that you were not in fact there, or perhaps your name appears in the minutes by error, I really do not know, but I should just like to stress that this is not a discharge debate but a political assessment of an annual report on implementation.

Mr Tugendhat, I must in all sincerity tell you that I have never been so disappointed by one of your replies as I was this evening. Did you not notice that this report and my remarks on it were aimed at three different institutions? To our own Parliament, i.e. to our specialist committees, urging them not to allocate appropriations unless it is absolutely certain that, if necessary, they will override the Council if it blocks new policies and that they will carry out their work with the national parliaments and governments in enough time to ensure that funds which we allocate to the budget here can actually be translated into political reality. That was the first institution my speech was aimed at. The second institution was the Council and the third the Commission, and this with the sole aim of making the Commission at last become tougher. The Commission is the executive body and the Council cannot place its all-encompassing authority above that of the Commission. I really cannot understand why it is that you keep coming here to do your party piece. The Commission must be strengthened, and Parliament has as its main task to protect the legal position of the Commission as well, because it is only through this that the legal position of Parliament can be maintained. This is something which I perhaps ought not to say, and I say it in the presence of Mr Cheysson, who in the toughest disputes with the Council, and even in some actions undertaken against the Council, but with the full backing from Parliament, has carried through policies, because he considered them to be necessary for the sake of the Community.

You are the Commissioner for instance without however having any of the powers of a Commissioner for Finance. Perhaps this is why your position in the Commission is not so strong. If I were organizing things then the Commissioner for Finance would have the strongest position in the Commission, but in that case he would also have to stand up for the jointly adopted budget, and I must remind you that the budget is adopted by two bodies, namely by the Council and Parliament. And when the Council — willingly or not — has agreed to the budget, and the President of Parliament has taken note that the budget is finally adopted, then it is the Council's downright duty to carry out this policy and it should not boycott it. If the Commission now becomes the accomplice of the Council, then it will share the Council's guilt *vis-à-vis* the Community.

Mr Tugendhat, Parliament's aggressivity is not primarily directed against the Commission, but it serves rather to strengthen the Commission, in order to give it some backbone and make it protect its legal position, because the legal position of the Commission

**Aigner**

is simultaneously the legal position of Parliament. Therefore, Mr President, please regard this discussion at such a late hour as an appeal to ourselves, to Parliament, but also as an appeal to the Commission that with the support of Parliament it should not let its legal position be constantly eroded. This afternoon we had a very interesting and intense discussion in the Committee for Budgetary Control and we proved exactly what it means if the Commission avail itself of its decision-making powers, thereby causing — since as we know, the Council, with its committees and its national bureaucracies, greatly interferes with the Commission's ability to make decisions — millions of units of account from European taxpayers to be thrown down the drain. It is the Commission's downright duty not just to come here and do its party piece, but to defend its real legal positions; this is the purpose of tonight's debate.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Tugendhat.

**Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission.** — Mr President, just two words. First of all, the Commission does not judge the strength by which it upholds the Treaty, which is its duty, by the pitch of the voice with which it does so. I realize that Mr Aigner feels strongly on these matters. So do I. But it is because I feel strongly that I have the temerity to point out to Parliament the need to observe procedure just as I point out to the Council the need to observe procedure. And if Mr Aigner's speech had borne any relation to the report, any relation to the report at all, then this debate would not have taken place. But really what he was saying in his speech and what was said in the report were not the same things. Now we have exchanged harsh words, but I must ask the House to understand that it is, I believe, only by observing the rules that one can in fact get most things done and if it comes to overturning the Treaty, then the Community itself finds itself at risk.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

#### 16. *Budgetary control aspects of the Computer Centre*

**President.** — The next item is the interim report drawn up by Mr Kellett-Bowman, on behalf of the Committee on Budgetary Control, on the budgetary control aspects of the Data-Processing Centre of the Commission of the European Communities (Doc. 1-283/80).

I call Mr Kellett-Bowman.

**Mr Kellett-Bowman.** — Mr President, in 1975 the Commission made an important political decision to go European in the field of data-processing. It was a courageous and far-reaching decision. It showed determination to be technologically independent of the United States and it backed an industrial policy by placing its confidence in European products.

Mr President, decisions made on other than commercial criteria are generally expensive and this was no exception. The budgetary authority has supported it with increasing credits. Furthermore, the changeover took a year longer than originally anticipated.

The European Court of Auditors drew attention to the situation and the Committee on Budgetary Control asked me to look into it. The situation is extremely complicated because since 1975 the development of this technology has been very rapid and because the uses and applications of it have exploded. The accounting machine of yesteryear is the means of electronic mail and business systems today. The demand for data-processing has also exploded.

Now, the committee has examined the public-accounting aspects. We confined our studies to those aspects which are within the remit of our committee, value for money, regularity of procedures, accounting matters, budgetary presentation, whether there was an adequate degree of coordination between the Community institutions and whether there were identifiable inefficiencies or waste.

This interim report, Mr President, was adopted by the committee last month but it is only an analysis of the situation. This is so because a definitive report must await two things — further information from the Commission and especially a reaction from the Court of Auditors, which is the expert accounting and verifying body of the Community and which I understand is checking on the situation at the data-processing centre. There is also an industrial-policy aspect to this matter. The new equipment at the centre has entailed a heightened degree of cooperation between western European companies. They have had to ensure new compatibility between their products. The implications for future worthwhile developments in this field are clearly considerable. This aspect is however primarily a matter for the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs. However, it merits a mention at this stage as it is dealt with in paragraph 12 of the motion for a resolution.

Mr President, I now turn to other aspects of the motion. In the recitals, I have made a link with the position adopted by our predecessors in the European Parliament of over five years ago. I have stressed the need to avoid duplication of effort by the institutions in the acquisition of equipment. I have also drawn

**Kellett-Bowman**

attention to the need to have regard to the medium and long-term prospects when making purchases of equipment. The motion is, I hope, clear and generally acceptable. It sets out the criteria that should guide the Commission and, indeed, the other institutions when acquiring and handling data-processing equipment. Centralization of effort is important. We cannot condone the emergence of several data-processing centres which in effect might be in competition with one another, thus wasting Community funds. The committee has stressed in this report the importance of budgetary transparency, of there being a clear presentation of the full costs of data-processing activities as well as of other activities.

As regards the four amendments which have been tabled, I would like to put forward briefly the following points. First of all, the Committee on Budgetary Control must see to it that there is no wasteful use of Community resources, which, unfortunately, are scarce enough already. Therefore, even if to some it may seem to be virtually axiomatic, we must state that overlapping of acquisition of equipment must be avoided. Secondly, wherever possible, there should be a sharing of costly equipment. If there is spare capacity on a machine, it should be readily available to another Community institution. Otherwise, we may have sheer waste of facilities with machines only partially utilized in separate institutions. Thirdly, in view of certain doubts that have been expressed, the Committee on Budgetary Control felt and the Commission did not object to this, that an appropriate binding formula should be evolved which would guarantee to other institutions that they would have access to the data-processing centre. These points are incontrovertible. They reflect the criteria that the Committee on Budgetary Control holds to be fundamental if we are to ensure that there is no waste of resources. The institutions must not indulge in avoidable duplication of purchases of equipment and a coherent approach to these matters must be established.

Now, Mr President, a report of this kind by its very nature tends to find fault and to omit praise. What must be said here, however, is that the conversion from one machine to another carried out by the Commission is the largest the world has yet seen. Whilst drawing attention to the problems, I cannot ignore what has been achieved. The staff and management concerned merit our thanks.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Notenboom to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

**Mr Notenboom.** — *(NL)* Mr President, on behalf of my Group I should like to thank the rapporteur for his interim report on a field in which he is undoubtedly

going to be faced with pressure groups, both internally and externally. We must be firm in resisting these pressures. The situation at present is that the Committee on Budgetary Control is as yet unable to present a final report, firstly because of the lack of a report from the Court of Auditors and secondly because the European Commission has not yet published its final decision on the acceptance of the new computer equipment. I shall not, therefore, discuss here the policy pursued by the Commission over the past few years with regard to computers. Mr Kellett-Bowman will have ample opportunity to do that when he presents his final report. Parliament will then be in a better position to hold a fundamental debate, as it will be better informed on the subject.

I should like here to dwell a little on the recommendations the rapporteur has put forward for institutions other than the European Commission. In paragraph 6 of the motion for a resolution, these seem to be quite categorical. The idea seems to be that all institutions must make as much use as possible of the Commission's Computer Centre for their data-processing. That is what it seems to say, though that may not be what is meant, as a number of points need to be made against this idea.

Firstly, these other institutions are not necessarily of the same opinion. Of course, that is not a conclusive argument. Everyone likes to build his own monument and it is understandable to be afraid of the difficulties that cooperation brings with it. That happens quite frequently. It was above all the refusal to accept this sort of argument which led Parliament in the past to declare that duplication of work and costly facilities should be avoided by centralizing all operations in the Commission's centre. In 1974 Parliament decided to set up a committee of enquiry to put some order into the question of the problems concerning the Computer Centre.

At that time the position was not the same as it is now. At that time it was only the Commission that had a reasonable number of computer applications. The other institutions were only beginning to use automated accounting systems. Now, however, all the institutions have various sorts of administrative applications and are busy considering more extensive projects. And the computer market is developing rapidly. The price of the equipment, the hardware, is falling steadily, sometimes in a quite spectacular way.

The latest models announced cost, for equivalent capacity, about a fifth of the price of their predecessors. And more and more programs in the most varied fields are available ready-made from the hardware manufacturers or from specialized software companies.

The general phenomenon of rising staff costs also makes increasing use of data-processing financially more attractive.



## Notenboom

All this means that centralizing as many applications as possible in a single computer centre is no longer so necessary from the economic point of view. On the contrary, above a certain threshold the extra effort required in administrative terms for adding new applications may often be more expensive than the combined costs of equipment and administration for a sensible decentralized system. Modern technology now makes this decentralization more possible than five years ago. It is comparable with the invention of the electric motor. With the big steam engine you had a single large unit. When the electric motor came along you could use the same capacity in a decentralized way. It is a question of the most recent developments.

More and more networks of small computers linked to one another are replacing the massive facilities, particularly where these massive facilities were used to run very large numbers of very varied programs.

The Commission's Computer Centre with its more than 150 applications is, in our view, a good example of a case where centralization is no longer justifiable. The Commission itself has developed grand schemes for interinstitutional networks, even extending to national institutions. If I am correctly informed, the Commission recently decided to move away from centralization in the Luxembourg Centre for its own departments as well.

I do not think, therefore, that in the present phase Parliament should call for compulsory centralization for the data-processing operations of all the institutions. I think we should bear in mind the developments of the last few years.

Perhaps this was not the rapporteur's intention. That is why I want to make this point as a rider to paragraph 6 of his motion, since taken literally paragraph 6 of the motion for a resolution simply says that the Computer Centre must be open to the other institutions, which is something we thoroughly agree with. I hope the rapporteur meant it this way, in which case we too can agree to this paragraph.

For the moment, I should just like to give a provisional opinion on Mrs Lizin's Amendment No 2. This seems to me to be a clarification, since what it ultimately says is that it is not so much the direct as the indirect staffing costs which are behind the increases. I think that also reflects what the rapporteur actually intends. Provided neither he nor the Member of the Commission has any objection, our group thus proposes to accept Amendment No 2 in the sense of a clarification of the rapporteur's intentions. There is still a lot of speaking time available to my group, but in view of the late hour I do not intend to make use of it. Once again, our sincere thanks to the rapporteur.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Tugendhat.

**Mr Tugendhat, Member of the Commission.** — The Commission has examined this interim report with great interest and, if I may, I should like to begin by thanking and congratulating the rapporteur, Mr Kellett-Bowman, on the careful and penetrating analysis he has made of the problems of the data-processing centre, as indeed, very clearly, has Mr Notenboom. The actual content of the report has, I think, been checked with the Commission services responsible and I therefore have no comment or criticism in that respect. If the report brings out one point with particular clarity, it is the need, after all the changes and difficulties of recent years, to let the Centre settle down to a period of stability and to get on with the work of meeting the Commission's data-processing needs. That, I think, is something which not only the Commission needs but, indeed, the other Community institutions with whom we come into contact and of course the Member States themselves.

Now I should like, if I may, to deal in my comments on the report with three main points. First of all, the background to the 1976 decision to accept the ICL tender; secondly, the intentions of the Commission with regard to contracts for equipment with ICL and with C2I Honeywell Bull and finally, the staffing position. So to begin with the 1976 tender.

As Mr Kellett-Bowman explains in the interim report, the data-processing centre has seen many changes and upheavals since it was set up in 1953 and by 1976 it had changed from an IBM computer to a C2I computer and back to an IBM computer. In 1976, the Commission decided to go for one main-frame system and an appropriate supporting terminal complex. The choice was finally between IBM, a tried and tested non-European machine, to which staff were accustomed, and ICL, an unfamiliar but European machine, to which a difficult and costly conversion programme would be necessary. The Commission, as is well known, took the decision to acquire the ICL computer and an network of terminals supplied by French, German and Italian manufacturers. As the interim report points out, this was a brave decision but, and Mr Kellett-Bowman said this as well, one which involved a heavy price in terms of time and money because of the need for the largest conversion operation attempted anywhere in the world. The alternative, of course, in the words of the report, was for the Commission, and I quote: 'to equip itself exclusively with non-European equipment for fear of not being able to overcome the problems posed by choosing European equipment'. I think, in those circumstances, that the Commission, as a quasi-governmental organization, was correct in what it did and I am grateful for the support which that decision has received in the House. Just as in the United States the Americans have a variety of ways of providing launching aid — their armed services, as is well known, provide a huge and

**Tugendhat**

often captive market for the latest forms of equipment which having launched themselves successfully in the public sector, as it were, are then highly competitive on the civilian market — I think that it is right for the European governments and for organizations such as the Commission to take, to adopt, within the confines of what is possible and practical for us, a similar approach in order to make sure that European high-technology industries survive and then compete on equal, and, perhaps, on even more than equal, terms with their competitors from overseas.

The conversion and testing of the ICL equipment is the next point to which I will turn. The ICL 2980 computer was installed in Luxembourg at the beginning of 1978 and was used in 1978 and 1979. It was used for the conversion of the Commission's programs and for the installation of the new network. The progress that was made permitted a preliminary acceptance of the ICL machine in June 1979. This enabled the Commission to terminate the rental contract for the IBM computer and its network. The IBM equipment was returned to the manufacturer at the end of October 1979. A final acceptance test took place in December 1979. This test revealed the following points: first of all, additional capacity for the central memory of the ICL 2980 was required. Secondly, the transfer to ICL of the CIRCE applications, the ECDOC part of which has always been executed at a C2I Honeywell Bull service bureau would require additional work, without the guarantee that the final result would be a success and I should perhaps point out here that CSA consists of two data bases; the ECDOC, which is internal documentation, and CELEX, which is a data base of Community law. The third point revealed was that the present workload of the Commission is 50 % greater than that envisaged in the call for tenders and the ICL machine is, in fact, currently working 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to take up a point which Mr Kellett-Bowman made in passing and I, of course, quite understand his desire to ensure that machines are working to a very considerable intensity and that is certainly the case at the moment.

Now, given this situation, the Commission decided to take final acceptance of the ICL computer providing the following conditions were met: ICL to provide the Commission with a further four megabytes of central memory free of charge, and ICL to establish in Luxembourg a service bureau in order to meet the growing workload of the Commission. The first year's use of the service bureau would be free of charge, given that the Commission decided not to transfer CIRCE to ICL. Furthermore the Commission decided to continue to run CIRCE on the C2I Honeywell-Bull service bureau. Negotiations with ICL and C2I Honeywell-Bull are still in progress. If the negotiations are successful, the Commission intends to sign a five-year contract with ICL for a service bureau — that would come to Bfr. 135 million a year for two-shift working, but with free use in the first year — and also to sign a

five-year contract with C2I Honeywell-Bull for running the CIRCE application which would amount to approximately Bfr. 50 million per year.

Finally, Mr Kellett-Bowman takes issue with the Commission on its estimates of the staff needed to run the centre. In 1978, the Commission engaged an outside firm to estimate the staffing needs. The firm concluded that an additional 144 posts were required. Despite demands in the 1979 and 1980 budget proposals, the Council and Parliament have refused to authorize any additional posts. This has meant that the Commission has been obliged to employ outside contract staff at much higher rates than would be paid if it were able to employ its own staff. I hope that Parliament will bear this in mind when it examines the 1981 budget proposals. Even assuming that there is room for argument over the figure of 144, there can be no dispute about the 53 or so posts that we shall seek in 1981.

Finally, Mr President, as I said at the beginning, the computer centre needs time to settle down and consolidate its position if it is to cope with the challenge of continuing demand for data-processing and Commission services. The Commission has recently set the guidelines for the future and has put in hand measures to improve the management structure, to identify and follow through priority tasks and to ensure that work on data-processing is planned in close cooperation with other institutions. In that connection, I have, of course, with my colleague, Viscount Davignon, had the opportunity of having an exchange of views with Mr Aigner and with Mr Kellett-Bowman and with others of their colleagues and certainly it is our desire to maintain the closest possible cooperation with the other institutions. We also, of course, as I made clear, look to the budget authority to provide us with the staff which we need to carry through the task. So there, Mr President, is the situation with which we find ourselves. It is late at night, so let me conclude by saying that so far as the proposal to delete paragraph 6 is concerned, we hope very much that the House will refrain from approving it.

**President.** — I call Mr Kellett-Bowman.

**Mr Kellett-Bowman.** — May I thank the Commissioner for his reply and at the same time quickly reassure Mr Notenboom that the intention of paragraph 6 is part of an interim report. I fully appreciate that the future may well lie in intercommunicating decentralized equipment, but I do not believe that during the period of time from this interim report to the final report institutions should be encouraged to go it alone.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

### 17. *Situation of refugees in the Horn of Africa*

**President.** — The next item is the report by Mr Marshall, on behalf of the Committee on Development and Cooperation, on the situation of refugees, particularly children, in the Horn of Africa (Doc. 1-289/80)

I call Mr Marshall.

**Mr Marshall, rapporteur.** — Mr President, can I say first of all that I should like to thank those Members who are still here and say I regret that those who speak most frequently about the problems of the underdeveloped world have not seen fit to stay.

The problems of the Horn of Africa are amongst the most depressing and tragic in the whole world. There are many more people at risk in the Horn of Africa than died at Hiroshima and Nagasaki combined and the plight of the refugees in the Horn of Africa makes the plight of the boat people appear almost like a Sunday-school picnic. The Horn of Africa demonstrates the conflicting philosophies of the West and the Soviet bloc, because in Africa the Russians have given arms to both sides over the Ogaden battle, whilst the United States has provided food aid. Thus the Russians have given both sides the means of destroying life, whilst the United States has provided the means of saving life. The situation in the Horn of Africa can be demonstrated by one statistic alone, that in Somalia 25 % of the population are refugees and of those 25 % no less than 80 % are women and children. But the most chilling fact about Somalia is that the living standards outside the refugee camps are even lower than the living standards in the refugee camps, because, owing to drought, that country is facing a crisis that is unprecedented even on the African continent.

This is an area of Africa which the Community assists under the Lomé Convention and where it seeks to help both to reduce the problems of the refugees and to improve the economy of the area. The international community has taken action to try and help the plight of the refugees in Somalia. The United States has been a generous provider of food aid. The United Nations has taken action and the Community has voted action as well. But some of us saw a programme on 19 June on BBC 2 and there were two questions flowing from that programme. The first is this: Is the assistance provided by the Community adequate? Secondly, are we going to get that assistance to Somalia on time? The aid was promised to Somalia in November 1979, but has taken a very long time to get there. Furthermore, one has to point out that the scale of the problem now is twice what it was in November 1979. The number of refugees in Somalia has doubled over that very short period of time.

What our report has asked for is this. First of all, an increase in food and other aid, because the need is

very much greater than was originally anticipated. Secondly, that there should be political action by the Council of Ministers. Europe could act as an honest broker in Africa to try and get at the root of the problem. Thirdly, we ask for half-yearly reports, preferably written reports, which I think mean much more to Members than verbal ones, so that the committee can monitor progress and so that we can deal with some of the misleading propaganda which is all too willingly put out by opponents of the Community. I also believe that the need to provide six-monthly reports acts as a spur for action.

When I saw this programme on television, the final scene was of a small child dying and my wife turned to me and said. 'Can't you do something to stop those things happening?' I believe the Community can and should do something to prevent the problems in Africa from being as great as they are. We as a Community can help to remove the scourge of disease, malnutrition and death from the Horn of Africa.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Griffiths to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Mr Griffiths.** — Mr President, on behalf of the Socialist Group I unreservedly wish to support the report made by Mr Marshall and support it in every one of its recommendations to the Commission and to the Council. I do not think I need to go into any of the details of the harrowing human experience which even now is going on in the Horn of Africa. I am glad that Mr Marshall drew attention to the programme of BBC 2 called 'Refugee', which I did not see because I happened to be in Brussels on Community business but which did draw the biggest response I have had on any matters relating to the European Community in my constituency. And I had an Oral Question down for Question Time, which, I hope, Mr Cheysson will be able to answer tonight.

Since putting down that question, I have made some enquiries myself about what the situation really is and, although I would now rephrase my question if I had the opportunity to do so, it still seems to me that there is cause for concern in that it did take the Community rather a long time to act from the time it received a message from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in Mogadishu to the time when aid actually began to make its way to the Horn of Africa. It was altogether, I believe, a period of about seven months, I shall be pleased if Mr Cheysson can refute this particular claim this evening, but the impression I have got is that the United States, for example, did provide aid much more quickly than the European Community was able to do, although, in saying this I realize also that other agencies which were party to an agreement to provide aid in the whole of Africa have

## Griffiths

also not been able to provide that aid as quickly as the United States. In supporting the motion and in asking the Oral Question, I do not wish to make an unreserved criticism of the European Community, but only to express the concern which people in the Community do have about the ability of the Community to act quickly when there are dire emergencies in the world. I believe, for example, that on other occasions the Community has been able to act much more quickly than it did in the case of the Horn of Africa and I express the hope that in future, when there is a call for help, help will come promptly and not take several months to be provided.

**President.** — I call Mr Cheysson.

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (F) Mr President, a few days ago, I had the sad privilege of informing journalists who were interviewing me during a press conference of the many efforts being made by the Community with regard to the refugee situation: 68 programmes in 1979 amounting to 100 million EUA — a figure already attained in 1980. All in all, 420 million EUA over the last four years.

Initially, efforts were mainly concentrated in the Middle East. There was a time when Asia was top of the list. At present, for reasons already referred to by the two previous speakers, Africa is obviously in the forefront of our concerns. I do not intend to talk about what we have done in Southern Africa or what we are doing in Chad, but shall confine myself to the Horn of Africa and the neighbouring countries since, as it has been quite rightly stated in one of the resolutions, the problems are inter-related: refugee problems caused by civil war or drought, drought problems and general turmoil. Mr President, in 1980 the Community is distributing a total of 43 million EUA in the form of aid in cash and kind out of a programme of 52.5 million earmarked for the second half of 1979 and 1980. This is a supplement to what was provided earlier and we intend to increase this in the near future with an additional grant of 9.5 million EUA, thus raising the total for 1980 to 52.5 million for the countries of the Horn of Africa.

In 1980 it is obviously Somalia which attracts major attention as a result of the huge number of refugees concentrated there. I think 1.5 million is an extremely overblown figure. The official figure of the High Commission for Refugees and non-governmental organizations is 750 000, which is nonetheless terrible for a country of about 4.5 million inhabitants.

Our efforts in Somalia, which have been the object of some — if I may say so, largely mistaken — comments, have taken the form of various types of aid. On the one hand, in 1980 food aid worth 12.5 million EUA was very quickly shipped to that country. On the other hand, aid in kind which initially amounted to

2 400 000 EUA was made available to the UNHCR — a decision referred to a few moments ago by the honourable Member.

The High Commission for Refugees asked for our assistance in two areas. Tents, blankets and medical supplies were sent by air lift and arrived at their destination within 15 days of the decision. The High Commission for Refugees, however, informed us that there was a very serious problem of transport. It therefore then asked that the rest of the aid amounting to about 2 million EUA be used to provide means of transport. To be more specific, it asked for 10 Land Rovers, 31 lorries and 30 trailers. As fate would have it, the UNHCR insists on a particular make of vehicle, the Land Rovers, and British Leyland requires six to nine months for delivery. We had therefore to look elsewhere for suppliers. It was thus possible to place our orders in two months. The equipment is just not available on the market for immediate sale.

The reason why six months passed between the decision and the arrival of the equipment in the field is the long period that every car firm currently requires to deliver vehicles specially equipped for such countries and the time of transport. For the other food aid programmes, we were able to operate by air lift or some other means, hence with quite remarkable speed.

Since then, Mr President, we have approved an additional allocation of 5 million EUA in cash, thus bringing our total contribution in 1980 to 20 million EUA for Somalia. I must point out here that we are by far the largest suppliers of aid to the refugees in Somalia. We consequently encounter enormous difficulties. For instance, the last allocation of 5 million EUA made available to the High Commission for Refugees — I shall not mention what other non-governmental organizations which we also support may be doing — has not been used owing to major problems of access to certain areas and problems connected with organizing and channelling the aid. Mr President, I would like to stress the fact that it is not as easy as it might appear to assist the needy in countries that are completely disorganized as a result of the influx of such people or of other events such as those that have occurred in Uganda.

The example of north-east Uganda is probably the most striking. The first lorries from the Community arrived in the Ugandan capital two weeks after the overthrow of Idi Amin. We have since then delivered huge amounts of food aid and yet famine is still raging in the north-eastern region of the country because for years roads, bridges and tracks have not been maintained. They are practically unfit for traffic during the rainy season, and so we have been obliged to organize an air lift. In other words, in countries that are completely disorganized, access to refugees and the delivery of means that are adapted to their needs are fraught with absolutely enormous problems.

## Cheysson

The possibility of such a dramatic situation becoming a permanent feature in certain parts of Africa is another major problem. I thank the rapporteurs and those who have stressed the very serious nature of the refugee situation in Uganda especially as things stand, there is no reasonable prospect of their returning to their homes. Such a situation may have very serious impact both on the people and on the political situation in the region. Consequently, like the rapporteur, Mr Marshall, I believe that a far-reaching political effort is essential in addition to aid to save people from starvation. If we want to give them a future, we must take systematic and integrated action to develop the areas where they may be resettled. Several amendments have quite rightly emphasized this point. We must also, through a comprehensive political approach, try to bring peace to this region and ensure that the neighbours once more begin some sort of cooperation, which is the only way to ensure that people no longer have to flee, suffer and die as they are now doing.

Mr President, my statement is, especially at such a late hour, mainly concerned with the Horn of Africa and the neighbouring countries. I could have said many other similar things about other parts of the world where refugees are also suffering. But we shall have a chance to discuss them tomorrow in the debate on two other aid projects concerning South-East Asia. I am, however, pleased to say that the resources provided by the Community are being fully utilized.

Would you like to have more detailed reports? I should be pleased to let you have them, Mr President, but let me say that as long as Parliament refuses to provide the staff, as long as it rejects the staff appropriations entered in the budget, I shall give priority to getting aid to the refugees rather than to supplying Parliament's committees with reports.

*(Applause)*

**President.** — I call Mr Michel to speak on behalf of the Group of European People's Party (Christian-Democratic Group).

**Mr Michel.** — *(F)* Mr President, ladies and gentleman, we owe the present debate to Mr Vergeer who, during the December part-session, tabled on behalf of our group a motion for a resolution with the request for urgent debate on the tragic situation in the Horn of Africa. The reason given to justify urgency was, at the time, that half the refugees on the African continent were in the Horn of Africa. There were almost a million displaced persons, many of whom were children suffering from serious malnutrition leading to almost certain death or at least irretrievably impairing their future physical and intellectual development. The reason for urgency yesterday is still cruelly valid today, and it is a very deplorable fact.

The motion for a resolution, which was unanimously adopted by urgent procedure, called first of all for a special Community aid programme for the countries of the Horn of Africa to reinforce already existing programmes. Secondly it called for an international conference, if possible under the aegis of the OAU, to achieve better regional cooperation, to assist the integration or voluntary repatriation of refugees and to improve communications and regional storage facilities for food buffer stocks. Thirdly, we asked the Community to organize its emergency and food aid on the basis of a systematic and ongoing development plan, as has just been stressed by Mr Cheysson. Lastly, we called on the Community to assume the fullest responsibility for transporting such aid and seeing to its proper delivery and distribution, and we also called for closer cooperation with the non-governmental organizations working in the field and often in a better position than other organizations to adapt the food aid to the needs of the local people.

The Commission, we must admit, did not react immediately in December 1979 to these very concrete proposals. As a result of the initiative taken by Mr Berkhouwer with regard to the desperate plight of the refugees in Somalia, the Commission provided the European Parliament with more specific information. Today, Mr Marshall's report provides an overall picture which, admittedly, is very concise, but the proposals, we feel, fall short of the suggestions in the resolution we tabled in December 1979.

That is why, Mr President, given the urgency of the matter, our group has submitted only three amendments to the resolution contained in Mr Marshall's report.

Firstly, our resolution deals with the reinforcement of food aid programmes and the full implementation of Articles 59 of the Lomé I and 637 of the Lomé II Conventions, so that all the means currently available could be used. Secondly, we are insisting that all the instruments of cooperation be geared to resolving the alarming situation of the million refugees in Somalia. Thirdly, we suggest that the Community considerably reinforce its support for non-governmental organizations which, in the field, are engaged in aid projects that are vital for the survival of the most underprivileged groups of the population.

We hope that, with Mr Cheysson's active participation in and positive contribution to our debate, the Horn of Africa will tomorrow become a priority area where the concrete suggestions made by our Committee on Development and Cooperation and, more specifically, Mr Ferrero's resolution on hunger in the world, will be put into practice. We shall be returning to this subject very soon and hope that the present organizational obstacles which often hamper the delivery of food aid and prevent it from being distributed rapidly and efficiently will be overcome.

Michel

We must do everything to buttress such emergency aid with some contribution to development. This is the task to which we must commit ourselves and it is to achieve this goal that we must provide the Commission with all the resources it needs in terms of staff and equipment.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Sir Fred Warner to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Sir Fred Warner.** — Mr President, I will make three points. The first concerns the relations between the Commission and Parliament and public opinion in this matter. You see, we know the difficulties you experience, Mr Commissioner, and we believe that you have done a most remarkable job in coping with them, but it is not enough to convince us that this is so. It is essential to convince public opinion, because in the last resort we depend on the attitude of the public to get you the funds and the personnel you need. This view has been expressed again and again in the Committee on Development and Cooperation, and it is true. If the public feels that the money being provided through the European Commission is not being adequately and effectively spent, there is far less enthusiasm to urge governments to provide money for these purposes.

Now I know that you have been in many ways unfairly treated by the press and by television. You would think that it was enough to cope with drought, war and starvation, without having to cope with press correspondents who feel it necessary to make accusations against people in order to make their programmes more interesting. Is there not enough in these programmes and these articles of human suffering and human drama, without having to drag in the imaginary defects of those who are trying to alleviate the situation? But that is what you are faced with, and I draw two conclusions from that. The first is that the Commission itself in Brussels and its agents in the field must constantly take infinite pains with journalists to tell them what is being done and how it is being done. Secondly, I think that Members of this Parliament, in dealing with their constituents, must take a robust line and must not accept all the criticisms which are made. They must say what is being done and give a good account of what Europe is doing.

That is my first point.

My second point is that it is particularly important in this case that the performance of the Commission should be seen to be first-class, because personally I believe that the emergency aid and the food aid given by Europe should all be channelled through the Commission's organization. The figures are hard to put together, but at the moment I think that the bulk of Europe's food aid — something like two-thirds of

food and emergency aid — is coming through the Commission rather than through national effort. I, for my part, think that with the experience you have and the large organization on the ground — or rather the large contacts, because I know your organization is not large — we should channel our whole effort in the years to come through the Commission. However, if we are going to persuade governments to do that, then the performance of the Commission must be seen to be outstanding and impeccable.

My third point is just to draw attention to paragraph 3 of the motion for a resolution and to say that this is not just put in for form's sake. It really is a most essential part of the motion in which we call upon the Council of Ministers to really try and launch some new diplomatic initiative. We have 17 000 Cuban troops in this part of Africa. What on earth are they doing there? We know that there is no work for them at home. We know that Castro does not know what to do with them if he has them in Cuba. But that is no reason why they should be sitting in Ethiopian garrison towns, releasing Ethiopian troops to go chasing the Eritreans and the people of the Ogaden all over the place. And what are the Russians doing? The reliable information provided is that one billion dollars' worth of arms have now been provided to Ethiopia. Are these for free? No, they are not. They are supposed to be paid for in cash or in commodities, and the truth of the matter is that the Ethiopian coffee crops and Ethiopian output for years to come are mortgaged against these arms. So that when at last the war does come to amend, when at last the refugees have been returned to their homes, they will have no means of living and we shall have to go on supporting them. So there really is a most deplorable situation which we would like to see the Foreign Ministers trying to cope with.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Coppieters.

**Mr Coppieters.** — (NL) Mr President, the problem of the refugees in the Horn of Africa has existed for quite some time and it leaves a rather sour taste in the mouth to realize that a motion for a resolution was tabled as early as January this year and that a report was not brought out until June. This is not a criticism of the Commission, but of our own institution.

A second point I should like to make is that the earlier motion for a resolution and the one contained in the Marshall Report are now already out of date, as the situation deteriorated over the months of May and June. There are now a million and a half refugees, who are fleeing increasingly not as a result of the war but because of the drought. Besides the food shortage and the new stream of refugees, there is also the risk of epidemics, as noted by medical teams in May and

## Coppieters

June. 80 % of these million and a half refugees, 700 000 of whom are staying in the camps in the north and 800 000 of whom are simply wandering around, are women and children. These are the facts, which means that our information is already out of date. I think the appeal for help was addressed to the Commission in autumn of 1979, and the decision by the Commission to provide aid dates from spring of 1980. Hence, my first question, which Mr Cheysson has already answered to a certain extent, is whether this aid granted in the spring of this year has in fact arrived?

This brings me to my second question, which has already been touched upon too. Is it really possible to provide effective aid with the personnel available? Our own Parliament is perhaps not completely innocent in this respect. I have tabled a number of amendments to the report which relate to the matters I have brought up. The first amendment concerns the change in the situation since December 1979 and, even if it only involves a phrase in the recitals, it is important since the nature of the emergency has changed.

My second amendment relates to the form which the aid should take and the problem of water supply. If the medical reports are accurate, many people are dying not only from hunger but often from thirst. I should like to ask the Commission whether there is any truth in statements by geologists to the effect that there are vast underground water supplies at not particularly great depth and that it would be fairly simple and cheap to drill wells? This water shortage is all the more important in view of the reports of a probable cholera epidemic, and which all the medical teams from Britain, Belgium, France and Germany were agreed in a report made in June this year. Another amendment concerns the possibility of providing aid rapidly by airlift. A fourth amendment concerns the fight against disease and a final one deals again with the work of this Parliament and of the Commission. We will not get very far with a six-monthly report if we consider that six months have elapsed between the appointing of the rapporteur and the appearance of his report. My amendment is clear. It proposes that we should be kept constantly informed, by means of a monthly report by the Commission, regarding both the aid provided and the difficulties encountered. I should also like to make an appeal to the committee, in the hope that the rapporteur will support my amendments. I urge the Committee on Development and Cooperation to consider the possibility of maintaining much closer contact, on whatever basis it thinks fit, with the Commission regarding this continuous flow of information, so that we too will be able to find out what is standing in the way of aid in the Horn of Africa.

(Applause)

**President.** — I call Mr Marshall.

**Mr Marshall, rapporteur.** — Mr President, at this very late hour I would merely like to thank the Commissioner for his very positive answers to the questions he was asked and say that it is perhaps unfortunate that in the three weeks which have elapsed between the BBC 2 programme and tonight none of this came out in the British press. I would therefore urge the Community to look at its information services so that, when we do things positively and well, we let the world know that we are doing them. There are enough people here willing to criticize the Community. We ought to blow our own trumpet when we have got something good to say, as we have in this particular case. I would ask the Commissioner to use his undoubted powers of persuasion to have even more done by the international community in Africa because this is a situation where we can never have enough done.

So far as the amendments are concerned, I will be dealing with those later today.

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (F) Mr President, I will be very brief, but there are two points to which I should like to reply.

First of all, I wish to tell Mr Coppieters, as I said a few moments ago, that the aid approved at the end of 1979 was transported by airlift. The last plane arrived at its destination on 27 January 1980. This should not be interpreted to mean that we did not start to act until the spring of 1980. We were active throughout 1978 and 1979 and we are still pursuing our effort. We still have 5 million EUA which have not been used owing to the difficulties encountered by the non-governmental organizations, and I just told you that we intended to propose a further 9½ million EUA.

Secondly, I wish to state again very clearly, Mr President, that I am not prepared to commit myself to producing a monthly report as long as I have to handle 68 emergency projects with just three A-grade officials. The Members of Parliament should not shy away from their responsibilities. When our proposal or request for an increase in our staff came before this Parliament, with the unanimous endorsement of the Committee on Budgets, it was rejected with some groups abstaining. Mr Michel, I would draw your attention to this point.

The last point, Mr President — I will not take the floor again — is about public opinion. We were shocked in 1979 to notice that world opinion was not aware of the Somali refugee situation. They were fewer then but had already reached 500 000. At the time, everyone was talking about the boat people and the Cambodian refugees. When (last December) I paid an official visit to Somalia. The country's President agreed, at my request, to allow some television teams networks to visit the country. To be more specific, we provided the initiative for the visits you referred to by

### Cheysson

the BBC, German, French and Belgian television teams. It was at our request that the President of Somalia lifted the ban on European television teams in Somalia covering areas where there was the most abject misery. Until then, the Somalis had refused on grounds of dignity. I cannot say I am pleased with the public emotion that has resulted — since it is caused by misery — but since such misery does exist, I am happy and proud that we helped to draw attention to it. If we are told in passing that we could have done more, I would agree. There is no doubt, however, that we are largely responsible for the fact that at present everyone in Europe is aware of the situation in Somalia, and I am proud to bring this to the attention of Parliament.

**President.** — The debate is closed.

The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

### 18. Membership of Parliament

**President.** — By letter of 18 June 1980 Mr Rey has informed me of his resignation as a Member of Parliament. Pursuant to Article 12(2), second subparagraph

of the Act concerning the election of the representatives of the Assembly by direct universal suffrage, the Assembly establishes that there is a vacancy and will immediately inform the Member State concerned thereof.

### 19. Agenda for next sitting

**President.** — The next sitting will be held on Friday, 11 July 1980 at 9 a.m., with the following agenda:

- Procedure without report
- Vote on one request for an early vote
- Decision on urgency
- Joint debate on three motions for resolutions on aid to South China, aid to Kampuchea and the border incident in Cambodia and Thailand
- Giummarra report on the importation of fresh lemons
- Gautier report on fishery resources
- Colleselli report on statistical surveys of areas under vines
- 10.30 a.m.: Vote on motions for resolutions on which the debates have been closed

*After 10.30 a.m. texts will be put to the vote at the end of each debate.*

The sitting is closed.

*(The sitting was closed at 0.20 a.m.)*



## SITTING OF FRIDAY, 11 JULY 1980

## Contents

1. <i>Approval of the minutes</i> . . . . .	307	<i>Mr Colleselli, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	320
2. <i>Documents received</i> . . . . .	307	<i>Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission</i> . .	321
3. <i>Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council</i>	307		
4. <i>Petitions</i> . . . . .	307	15. <i>Votes</i>	
5. <i>Membership of Parliament</i> . . . . .	307	— <i>Peters report (Doc. 1-215/80): Restructuring of the steel industry</i>	
6. <i>Membership of committees</i> . . . . .	307	<i>Amendment to paragraph 2:</i>	
7. <i>Procedure without report</i> . . . . .	307	<i>Mr Peters, rapporteur; Mr Klepsch</i> . . .	321
8. <i>Decision on an early vote</i> . . . . .	308	<i>Amendment to paragraph 3:</i>	
9. <i>Decision on urgent procedure:</i>		<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	321
<i>Lady Elles; Mr Vergeer</i> . . . . .	308	<i>Amendment to paragraph 5:</i>	
10. <i>Aid to refugees in the South China Sea — Aid to Kampuchea — Border incident between Vietnamese and Thai troops — Joint debate on motions for resolutions by Mr Schieler and others (Doc. 1-284/80), Mr Israël and others (Doc. 1-301/80/rev.) and Mr Rinsche and others (Doc. 1-312/80):</i>		<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	322
<i>Mr Schieler</i> . . . . .	308	<i>Amendment to paragraph 8:</i>	
<i>Mr Israël</i> . . . . .	308	<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	322
<i>Mr Rinsche</i> . . . . .	309	<i>Amendments to paragraph 9:</i>	
<i>Mr Wawrzik (EPP); Mrs von Alemann (L); Mr Fergusson (ED); Mrs Dienesch (EPD); Mr Purvis; Mr Seeler; Mr Israël; Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission</i> . . . . .	309	<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	322
11. <i>Human rights in Argentina — Motion for a resolution by Mr Klepsch and others (Doc. 1-318/80):</i>		<i>Amendments to paragraph 10:</i>	
<i>Mr Penders (EPP)</i> . . . . .	315	<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	322
<i>Mr Glinne (S)</i> . . . . .	315	<i>Amendment after paragraph 10:</i>	
12. <i>Importation of fresh lemons — Report by Mr Giummarra on behalf of the Committee on External Economic Relations (Doc. 1-285/80):</i>		<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	323
<i>Mr Del Duca, deputy rapporteur</i> . . . . .	316	<i>Amendments to paragraph 11:</i>	
<i>Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission</i> . .	316	<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	323
13. <i>Conservation and management of fish-stocks — Report by Mr Gautier on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-304/80):</i>		<i>Amendments to paragraph 13:</i>	
<i>Mr Gautier, rapporteur</i> . . . . .	316	<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	323
<i>Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission; Miss Quin (S); Mr Battersby (ED); Mr Nyborg (EPD); Mr Kirk; Mr Provan</i> . . . .	317	<i>Amendment to paragraph 14:</i>	
14. <i>Statistical surveys of areas under vines — Report by Mr Colleselli on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture (Doc. 1-302/80):</i>		<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	323
		<i>Amendments to paragraph 15:</i>	
		<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	324
		<i>Amendments to paragraph 16:</i>	
		<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	324
		<i>Amendments to paragraph 17:</i>	
		<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	324
		<i>Amendment after paragraph 17:</i>	
		<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	325
		<i>Amendments to paragraph 21:</i>	
		<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	325
		<i>Amendments to paragraph 22:</i>	
		<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	325
		<i>Amendments to paragraph 23:</i>	
		<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	325
		<i>Amendment to paragraph 24:</i>	
		<i>Mr Peters</i> . . . . .	325
		<i>Explanations of vote: Sir Peter Vanneck; Mrs Clwyd; Mr Martin; Mr Van Minnen; Mr Peters; Mr Nordlohne (EPP); Mr Oehler; Mrs Kellett-Bowman; Mr Calvez (L)</i> . . . . .	326

Mr Balfe . . . . .	328	— Aigner report (Doc. 1-275/80): Implemen- tation of the 1979 budget:	
Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	328	Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	333
— Hoff report (Doc. 1266/80): Contribu- tions to the ECSC from the general budget:		— E. T. Kellett-Bowman interim report (Doc. 1-283/80): Budgetary control aspects of the Data-Processing Centre:	
Amendments to paragraph 2:		Mr Kellett-Bowman, rapporteur; Mr Colla; Mr Kellett-Bowman . . . . .	334
Mrs Hoff, rapporteur . . . . .	329	Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	334
Amendment to paragraph 3:		— Marshall report (Doc. 1-289/80): Situa- tion of refugees in the Horn of Africa:	
Mrs Hoff . . . . .	329	Amendment after the first indent of the preamble:	
Amendments to paragraphs 4 and 5:		Mr Marshall, rapporteur . . . . .	334
Mrs Hoff . . . . .	329	Amendment after the third indent of the preamble:	
Amendment after paragraph 5:		Mr Marshall . . . . .	334
Mrs Hoff . . . . .	330	Amendments to paragraph 1:	
Procedural motions: Mr Lange; Mr Bangemann; Mr Arndt; Mr Klepsch; Mr Seal; Mr Balfe . . . . .	330	Mr Marshall . . . . .	334
Explanations of vote: Mr Spencer; Mrs Kellett-Bowman . . . . .	331	Amendments after paragraph 1:	
Procedural motion: Mr Provan . . . . .	331	Mr Marshall . . . . .	335
Explanation of vote: Mr Bonde . . . . .	331	Amendment to paragraph 2:	
Mrs Hoff; Mr Calvez . . . . .	331	Mr Marshall . . . . .	335
Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	332	Amendment to paragraph 4:	
— von Wogau report (Doc. 1-236/80):		Mr Marshall . . . . .	335
Industrial products from third countries:		Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	335
Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	332	Explanation of vote: Mr Griffiths . . . . .	335
— von Wogau report (Doc. 1-141/80):		— Schieler et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-284/80): Aid to refugees in the South China Sea:	
Motor vehicles, certain construction plant, textile names, electrical equipment and biodegradability:		Explanation of vote: Lady Elles . . . . .	336
Amendments to paragraph 3:		Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	336
Mr von Wogau, rapporteur . . . . .	332	— Israël et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-301/80/rev.): Aid to Kampuchea:	
Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	332	Amendment after paragraph 4:	
— de Ferranti report (Doc. 1-224/80):		Mr Israël . . . . .	336
Powered industrial trucks:		Rejection of the motion . . . . .	336
Amendment to paragraph 4:		— Rinsche et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-312/80): Border incident between Vietnamese and Thai troops:	
Lady Elles, deputy rapporteur . . . . .	332	Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	336
Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	332	— Seal et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-316/80); EEC-US relations in the steel sector:	
— Cottrell report (Doc. 1-267/80): Integra- tion of railway undertakings:		Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	336
Amendment to paragraph 1:		— Klepsch et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-318/80): Human rights in Argen- tina:	
Mr Cottrell, rapporteur . . . . .	333	Explanation of vote: Lady Elles . . . . .	336
Amendment to paragraph 3:		Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	336
Mr Cottrell . . . . .	333	— Giummarra report (Doc. 1-285/80): Importation of fresh lemons: Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	
Amendment to paragraph 4 (i):		— Gautier report (Doc. 1-304/80): Conser- vation and management of fish-stocks:	
Mr Cottrell . . . . .	333		
Amendment to paragraph 5:			
Mr Janssen van Raay . . . . .	333		
Amendment to paragraph 9:			
Mr Cottrell . . . . .	333		
Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	333		
— Buttafuoco report (Doc. 1-218/80): Trans- port infrastructure:			
Adoption of the resolution . . . . .	333		

<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	336	17. <i>Membership of Parliament</i> . . . . .	337
— <i>Colleselli report (Doc. 1-302/80): Statistical surveys of areas under vines:</i>		18. <i>ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly</i> . . . . .	337
<i>Adoption of the resolution</i> . . . . .	336	19. <i>Dates of the next part-session</i> . . . . .	337
<i>Lord O'Hagan</i> . . . . .	337	20. <i>Approval of the minutes</i> . . . . .	337
16. <i>Membership of committees</i> . . . . .	337	21. <i>Adjournment of the session</i> . . . . .	337

IN THE CHAIR: MR DANKERT

*Vice-President*

(*The sitting opened at 9 a.m.*)

**President.** — The sitting is open.

#### 1. *Approval of the minutes*

**President.** — The minutes of proceedings of yesterday's sitting have been distributed.

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

#### 2. *Documents received*

**President.** — I have received a number of documents, which you will find listed in the minutes.

#### 3. *Texts of treaties forwarded by the Council*

**President.** — I have received from the Council certified true copies of a number of documents. These will be listed in the minutes of proceedings and deposited in the archives of the European Parliament.

#### 4. *Petitions*

**President.** — Today's minutes will also include the details of various decisions taken by the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions.

#### 5. *Membership of Parliament*

**President.** — The Belgian authorities have informed me that Mr Beyer de Ryke has been appointed Member of the European Parliament to replace Mr Rey.

I welcome the new Member and remind the House that any Member whose credentials have not yet been verified may provisionally take his seat in Parliament or on its committees with the same rights as other Members.

#### 6. *Membership of committees*

**President.** — I have received from the Socialist Group a request for the appointment of Mr Hänsch to the Committee of External Economic Relations, to replace Mr Fellermaier.

I have received from the Liberal and Democratic Group a request for the appointment of:

- Mr Damseaux to the Political Affairs Committee;
- Mr Combe to the Committee of Economic and Monetary Affairs, to replace Mr Damseaux; and
- Mr Beyer de Ryke to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, to replace Mr Bangemann.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

#### 7. *Procedure without report*

**President.** — I announced on Monday the title of the Commission proposal to which it was proposed to apply the *procedure without report* provided for in Rule 27 A.

Since no one has asked leave to speak and no amendments have been tabled to it, I declare this proposal approved.

8. *Decision on an early vote*

**President.** — The next item is a decision on the request for an early vote on the *Seal et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-316/80): EEC-US relations in the steel sector.*

I put the request to the vote.

The request is approved. The vote will therefore take place at the next voting-time.

9. *Decision on urgent procedure*

**President.** — The next item is a decision on the request for the adoption of urgent procedure in respect of the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Klepsch and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and by Mr Enright and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, on human rights in Argentina (Doc. 1-318/80).

I call Lady Elles.

**Lady Elles.** — Mr President, although we accept that this is a very important matter, if we are presented with this kind of subject on the very last morning and then asked to debate it sensibly on that same morning without any background information, I think it is impossible to do our work properly as parliamentarians. Obviously people will vote as they like if they want to debate it this morning. But I really do protest, because we can get no information from our Foreign Offices or from anybody who can tell us what the background is. Although I, of course, applaud the sentiments behind this document, none of our group, I think, can debate this matter sensibly, because we cannot contribute on the basis of facts known. So I would ask that these motions should not be presented at the very last minute if Parliament wants to be taken seriously.

**President.** — I call Mr Vergeer

**Mr Vergeer.** — (NL) Mr President, I should just like to explain briefly why we have made this request. I admit that we have done so very late in the day, but I hope that Lady Elles will believe me when I say that it was simply not possible to act any earlier because we did not receive definite reports until yesterday. These reports speak for themselves. They concern the lives of four people. I have been informed this morning that it is probably already too late for two of the four. We cannot therefore wait until September. Hence my sincere appeal to Parliament to agree to this request.

**President.** — I put the request to the vote.

The request is approved.

The motion for a resolution will therefore be placed on today's agenda.

10. *Aid to refugees in the South China Sea — Aid to Kampuchea — Border incident between Vietnamese and Thai troops*

**President.** — The next item is a joint debate on

- the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Schieler and others on behalf of the Socialist Group, Mr Wawrzik and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), and Mrs Agnelli and others on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group, on aid to refugees in the South China Sea (Doc. 1-284/80);
- the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Israël and others on the follow-up to the Geneva International Conference on humanitarian aid to Kampuchea (Doc. 1-301/80/rev.); and
- the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Rinsche and others on the border incident between Vietnamese troops from Cambodia and Thai troops in Thailand (Doc. 1-312/80).

I call Mr Schieler.

**Mr Schieler, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I commented at some length on this matter when justifying the need for urgent procedure, and I can therefore now be brief. We know that the flow of refugees in the South China Sea is increasing rapidly, and we know that many refugees are in constant danger of drowning. There is now only one ship operating as a rescue vessel in the South China Sea, the 'Cap Anamur', which has rescued some 2 500 refugees from acute danger since February 1980.

We have two problems with this ship, and that is the crux of our motion for a resolution. Firstly, it cannot rely solely on donations as it has done in the past. If financial aid is not forthcoming, the 'Cap Anamur' will have, as other European ships have had, to cease its rescue operations for lack of funds. You are therefore asked to urge the Commission to support the 'Cap Anamur' with funds from the Community budget. Secondly, the Council is asked to urge the governments of the Member States to increase their quotas in view of the renewed increase in the stream of refugees and to act together in sharing these refugees among the Member States.

Ladies and gentlemen, the refugee problem in the South China Sea requires rapid and unified action on

**Schieler**

the part of the Member States. I would therefore appreciate your approval of this motion.

**President.** — I call Mr Israël.

**Mr Israël.** — (*F*) The motion we have put before you concerns a place situated on the frontier between Thailand and Kampuchea. There are places in the world on which a curse has been put. Auschwitz is such a one. The region of which I speak now brings a grave challenge to civilized mankind. The third genocide of this century is under way and we cannot, obviously, turn a blind eye to it. In this accursed region the warlords come to recruit their followers. They misappropriate the humanitarian aid sent there by civilized countries, they abduct young girls and make them work in brothels, they deny children all possibility of rescue. What is original in this motion is that we propose the creation of a neutral zone which armed forces would not be allowed to enter. Quite clearly, this neutral zone would be no more than a partial remedy. The ideal would be for the whole of Kampuchea to be neutralized. But this is scarcely feasible, and so we propose as an extremely important first step the creation of a neutral zone under United Nations supervision.

We also ask the Office of the High Commission for Refugees to ensure that the unaccompanied refugee children are protected. That is the essential point in the resolution. For large numbers of children are wandering around the area lost and bereft of the protection which should automatically be given to children. We therefore ask that they be allowed to leave and be found new homes with adoptive families. The great problem here is that one can never be sure that the children are in fact abandoned. The basic principle must be that families should be reunited whenever possible, but sometimes uncertainties arise where a child leaves the country and its parents come out shortly afterwards. We suggest that this kind of situation be looked into very carefully, but we think it absolutely imperative to do everything that can be done to get abandoned children out of this accursed region. That is why, Mr President, I ask that this resolution be given the unanimous support of the House.

**President.** — I call Mr Rinsche.

**Mr Rinsche.** — (*D*) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, the tragedy in Kampuchea and the immeasurable suffering of the people living in that country are among the darkest chapters of recent history. We have the means to draw attention to this tragedy from this Parliament and to do everything in our power to alleviate the suffering of the people concerned. Our motion therefore refers to the fact that the 'land-bridge' from Thailand to the Kampuchean refugee

camps has been broken as a result of the Vietnamese aggression and that there is therefore an acute danger that the aid which we and other organizations have made available will no longer be able to reach these camps. There is consequently an acute danger of thousands of refugees dying of hunger.

This is neither the time nor the place to deliberate on the motives for the attacks by Vietnamese troops on Thai territory; nevertheless, we should bear the political aspects of this tragedy in mind. We therefore ask the House to express its disapproval of the violation of the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of Thailand. Thailand and its fellow member States in ASEAN have joined with the Foreign Ministers of the Community in drawing attention to these problems. The ASEAN States now need a political sign of solidarity from the European Community. That is why we sincerely ask you to consider, not only the humanitarian, but also the political side of this serious problem.

It is clear that the danger of further hostile activities has not yet been eliminated. There are various ways of providing at least indirect assistance. For example, the European governments might lend their support in the General Assembly of the United Nations to the proposal made by the ASEAN States that a UN observer team should be stationed on the frontier. This idea should at least be approached with an open mind.

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we ask you most sincerely to approve this motion for a resolution, firstly, to demonstrate political understanding of certain requirements for the maintenance of peace in our times and secondly, because the cooperation agreement between the ASEAN States and the European Community now needs a clear sign of unity and solidarity.

**President.** — I call Mr Wawrzik to speak on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD).

**Mr Wawrzik.** — (*D*) Mr President, the reasoning behind the proposal that some of the costs incurred by the 'Cap Anamur' should be financed is that we should provide humanitarian aid and also that citizens of the Community are performing a task which has already been discussed here in the past. It should really have been a task for the European Community. This group of citizens has now turned to us for financial help, and I feel we have a duty to act. The total sum involved, the cost of hiring the ship, is not so high as to make it impossible for us to raise the money. I therefore ask the House to approve the motion for the reasons already given by Mr Schieler.

**President.** — I call Mrs von Alemann to speak on behalf of the Liberal and Democratic Group.

**Mrs von Alemann.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, on behalf of my group and myself I should like once again to refer to the activities of the 'Cap Anamur'. These activities are perhaps best illustrated by a telegram the ship's master sent to his organization committee on 10 March 1980. This telegram reads: On Friday morning, the 'Cap Anamur' took aboard 20 Vietnamese refugees, 6 of them badly injured, from a sinking boat. Two of them, who had bullets in their lungs, were flown out to Singapore, but one man died on board. The boat had also been fired on by the Vietnamese military before the 'Cap Anamur' could reach it. Shortly afterwards, 214 refugees were rescued from a sinking boat. They had not had any water for days.

I believe this telegram shows what the 'Cap Anamur' and other ships have been doing in recent years. This is why the Liberal and Democratic Group has associated itself with this action through Mrs Agnelli, on whose behalf I am presenting this report, since she is unable to be present, and this is why I wish to address you here today.

The 'Cap Anamur' can carry 400 people. It has a helicopter aboard, which means that the injured can be flown out and the ship can, if necessary, defend itself against attacks by pirates. It has a hospital aboard, a ward with 150 beds. It was originally a merchant vessel of 6 350 tonnes. The hospital has a medical team of three doctors, one of whom is a surgeon and one a children's doctor. There are also three nurses on board the ship. Between February and July 1980, 2 737 boat people were rescued by the vessel: 2 737 people who would in all likelihood have otherwise drowned. The whole operation has hitherto been financed voluntarily by donors who cannot provide any further help, as Mr Schieler and Mr Wawrzik have said. There is the cost of chartering the ship, the cost of the food, the cost of the staff, although at the moment the charter costs are causing the organizers the greatest problems.

You may be wondering, of course, why we are asking for further finance to be provided, since we all know that the Commission of the European Communities has already made 43.9 m EUA available for Kampuchean refugees. But, ladies and gentlemen, I feel it is important to point out once again that, since our original idea of fitting out a European ship could not be put into practice because of the difficulties there would have been over a European flag, which does not, of course, exist, we now have the opportunity of having this ship, the 'Cap Anamur', sail under our flag, as it were, and that, if we agree to pay the cost of chartering this vessel, we shall at last have our European ship. After all, it has been sailing for us, in the true spirit of Europe. Like the other two before it — the French and Norwegian vessels — this ship has quite deliberately chosen for itself a name similar to those of its predecessors to show that it is a European ship. The organizers and the people who have worked aboard it have quite consciously acted in the European spirit for us as representatives of the European

peoples. I would therefore ask you to approve this proposal and to agree with me that we should make more money available for this humanitarian operation.

But I should also like to raise another point. Major difficulties are still being encountered when other ships come across and, above all, take aboard refugees they find. As you probably know, if a ship rescues refugees from the sea, it must take them to its home country. We have therefore again referred to the quotas in our motion. The 'Cap Anamur', which sails under the German flag, passes the refugees it rescues on to transit camps, and the Germans have in the past taken many, if not all, of the people rescued by the 'Cap Anamur'. Other countries have done the same. But I call on our governments, the Council and Commissioner Cheysson to do what they can to change this quota system, because the problem is not that the 'Cap Anamur' only rescues refugees for Germany and other ships sailing under the French or Italian flag do the same for their countries: the problem is that ships sailing under cheap flags do not know what to do with the refugees. There has been a case of a ship of this kind, having picked up refugees, lying to in Singapore for 16 days, because the authorities in Singapore did not know where to put the refugees, not having a country they could pass them on to.

This is a very difficult problem; of that I am well aware; but if all people of goodwill, witnessing this inconceivable tragedy, join in once again approaching their governments, the countries of Europe may then be prepared to adopt a quota system or some arrangement with a transit camp from which the refugees can be distributed — a system, that is, which helps the refugees. We do not want any new bureaucracy. We do not want to make things more difficult. We want to make things easier with a system of this kind, because it is conceivable that more refugees could be absorbed if there were a proper arrangement for looking after them. I therefore ask you to vote for these motions, and I thank you for your attention.

**President.** — I call Mr Fergusson to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Fergusson.** — Mr President, may I begin what I want to say with a very strong protest with which I think you will agree? If we are to have urgent motions of this sort taking up Parliament's time on a Friday morning, I do feel that the least we can expect of those who put their names down in support of these motions is that they will take the trouble to turn up at the debates that follow.

If you compare the names on these three motions with those who are sitting around this House, you will find that the tally is an absolute disgrace. I do think that this point should be made most strongly to those who

Fergusson

vote for the adoption of urgent procedure on Friday mornings.

Mr President, these three motions — the one on the South China Sea and the other two on the Kampuchean refugees — are, as Mr Rinsche says, something more than a mere humanitarian appeal on behalf of the people of Europe to help the surge of refugees fleeing from, or being driven out of, their own countries in South-East Asia. And they have even more than the political move which Mr Rinsche rightly calls for. It has to be pointed out again that the scandal of the refugees on the seas, the running atrocity of the Kampuchean children, the bloodiness on the Thai-Chambodian border, the fearful choice of tyrannies now facing the Kampuchean People, all this is Communism at work and Soviet Communism, directly or indirectly, at that. It is becoming more and more evident that the further left one moves in the political spectrum, the more one finds that they concentrate on dogma and power and the less they care about people.

Mr President, we in this group shall vote for the Schieler motion, noting, if we may — because one has to appreciate at the same time the tremendous pressure these crowds of refugees are putting upon the region — that 40 % of all the Vietnamese refugees are now in Hong Kong, which has troubles of its own, as you know. Of the other two motions, we greatly prefer the Rinsche motion to the Israël one: we therefore hope that the Israël one will be dropped and that the Rinsche one will hold, because we believe that the Rinsche motion reflects Thai needs and hopes and Thailand's own views on the possibility of stabilizing the frontier. For that reason, if we want to help to alleviate the appalling needs facing Thailand, we do believe that the Rinsche motion is the better one. The other thing I wish to say is that, if we do pass the Rinsche motion, we feel that it also ought to be forwarded to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, since there is a call in it for a UN observer team to be stationed on the frontier.

**President.** — I call Mrs Dienesch to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mrs Dienesch.** — (F) Mr President, my Group welcomes these three motions. They do in fact cover matters on which we have already expressed our views in the past.

Mr Israël's motion in particular puts forward two ideas of great importance for the future of the Kampuchean people. The first concerns the protection of children. I think that no one in this House can fail to approve measures designed to save these little children from the terrible fate threatening them.

As regards the suggested neutral zone, I may say that this is not strictly speaking a new proposal, although it

is perhaps more specific than previous ones. Our House advocated a solution along these lines both in October and, if I remember correctly, in May on the occasion of Mrs Macchiocchi's resolution. On these points, therefore, we are not breaking new ground, we are seeking something which the Assembly has already approved, although our approach is now perhaps somewhat more realistic.

As regards the other two motions my feeling is that if we are to have any impact on events we must present a fully united front, and I therefore urge my colleagues, whatever preferences they may have, to support these resolutions of our European Assembly. Mrs von Alemann took up a moment ago an idea previously suggested by Mrs Louise Weiss, namely that European efforts might advantageously be concerted under a European flag.

Irrespective of the preferences people may have for one or other of the aims set out in these motions, I think that what is needed is that we should adopt all three, unanimously, to show our determination that a solution be found to these problems, which claim our attention virtually at every part-session. I have made a tally of the speeches given on this subject. We arrive at a total close on one hundred. Mr President, I should be very happy if we could be informed of the reactions of the international organizations to the dozen or so resolutions that we have adopted in the course of the dozen or so part-sessions that have been held since the directly elected Parliament came into existence. I should also like them to be given some publicity, since we have the impression that we adopt excellent resolutions but that these never seem to have an impact at the United Nations.

**President.** — I call Mr Purvis.

**Mr Purvis.** — Mr President, I too can broadly support the Rinsche resolution. However, I would recommend a certain amount of caution on this question of the land bridge mentioned in paragraph 4. I feel that the Political Affairs Committee should consider this in greater detail. The reason for the Vietnamese incursion into Kampuchea was their fear that Pol Pot troops were being replenished within Kampuchea. I express no value judgment on these two equally unpleasant régimes, but this is the cause of the great crisis on the border and of the incursions into Thailand.

The other problem that we really have to try and help the international voluntary organizations and the UN High Commission for Refugees to deal with is the large number of people still in informal camps. This has been aggravated by the recent incursions. They have just moved a mile or two down the road and set up camps with their own organizations. This is the problem. About 300 000 refugee families are in official

**Purvis**

camps, which are well administered: they have hostels for the unaccompanied children in particular, with Kampuchean housemothers, supervised by people from the international organizations. The real problem is in the unofficial camps, where more organization, more money and, perhaps, more people are needed.

So let us help the Thais and help the international organizations, which have long experience. I would ask my colleagues not to be swayed by spur-of-the-moment emotional outbursts from people outside this Chamber. Try to get both sides of the story from the experts who have actually had to deal with this problem in Kampuchea, Thailand and all over the world in the last 20 or 30 years. That, I think, we have to stress. They are people who know their job. We would not pretend to tell experts in any other field how to do their work. I do not know enough about it, and I am sure none of the people in this Chamber can possibly claim to know enough about it. We rely on the UN, on the Red Cross, on Oxfam, on Christian Aid and all the other experienced charities to do that for us. We have to provide them with the means to do a good job and to help improve the political environment in South-east Asia, so that they can get on and do the humanitarian work that is necessary.

**President.** — I call Mr Seeler.

**Mr Seeler.** — (D) Mr President, I should like to say to one of the previous speakers, who rightly complained that urgent motions tabled on Friday morning are always discussed before an almost empty House, that the situation here is the same as in church: criticism is always aimed at the wrong people. Those for whom the criticism is intended are not, of course, here on a Friday morning.

I should just like to say a few words on the Rinsche motion. For several months now we have been witnessing a very disturbing development in the South-East Asian theatre. The Communist imperialism of Vietnam, which some time ago marched into Kampuchea on the pretext that it was liberating the people of that country from the Pol Pot régime, is in the process of crossing Kampuchea's borders and so revealing its true intention of extending Vietnam's sphere of influence beyond its own borders. That is what underlies developments in that part of the world.

Mr Rinsche referred to the cooperation agreement that was debated in this House some months ago. This cooperation agreement between the Community and the ASEAN States is not only an economic cooperation agreement: it also expressly states that we support the efforts of the ASEAN States to establish a zone of peace, a zone of neutrality in that part of the world. Now, with the modest means at our disposal, we have a chance to apply this provision of the agreement and to make it clear that we do not accept the developments about to take place in that area.

I do not believe there are many opportunities open to this Parliament, but we should — and this is why I agree with Mr Rinsche's motion — make it clear that we cannot tolerate and that we condemn aggression and acts of imperialism wherever they may occur in the world. I therefore say to the previous speaker that he should not place his trust in first hearing the views of experts, or whatever: we should make it clear here and now, by adopting Mr Rinsche's motion, that our political view, our political position is that we utterly condemn Vietnam's act of imperialistic aggression against Thailand.

**President.** — I call Mr Israël.

**Mr Israël.** — (F) Mr President, I would say to Mr Fergusson that one cannot have a humanitarian approach to a problem such as this without an underlying political will. So much is quite evident. Nevertheless, I feel it would be wrong for our political option to delay in any way action at the humanitarian level. If this Parliament is considering the matter under urgent procedure it is because an immediate solution must be found. We can scarcely expect today to resolve the problem between East and West, between Communism and imperialism. I do not know, Mr Fergusson, if Communism is necessarily involved in the persecution of Kampuchean children. What I do know beyond a peradventure is that we must get them out of that accursed region with the least possible delay, so I do not wish to become embroiled in subtle points of argument. It is imperative that we adopt a resolution that will demonstrate the true political ethic of Europe. It is in the cause of that ethic, Mr President, that I am happy to be speaking at the end of this debate. I would ask that the debate be closed and that these resolutions be adopted.

**President.** — We have not yet reached the end of the debate, Mr Israël.

I call Mr Cheyssou.

**Mr Cheyssou, Member of the Commission.** — (F) Mr President, as Mrs Dienesch pointed out just now, Parliament has on many occasions since its election given thought to the problems of the refugees in South-East Asia. The Members of this House are united in their determination to find a solution, as indeed are the other institutions of the Community. I am pleased therefore that today's debate gives us an opportunity to examine some specific aspects without having to look again at the problem overall.

The debate falls naturally into two parts. The problem of the boat people is different from that which has arisen as a result of the incidents on the frontier between Vietnam and Thailand, on the Kampuchean



## Cheyssou

frontier. I therefore propose to reply separately to the remarks that have been made on these two subjects.

Let us take the problem of the boat people first. I would point out at the outset that the Community has been active since the beginning of this affair, before the July 1979 conference chaired by the Secretary-General of the United Nations and indeed ever since. Can we do more? One idea put forward in one of the resolutions is that we should give direct support to a ship which is at present doing wonderful work, and to which I pay tribute. I refer of course to the 'Cap Anamur'. This ship is not the only one engaged in this work at the moment, for two American ships and a German one are also doing so. We have for a long time had contacts with the German non-governmental organization which chartered the 'Cap Anamur', namely 'Ein Schiff für Vietnam', the equivalent of the 'ship for Vietnam' which had previously sent out the 'Ile de Lumière'.

There are two reasons why we have so far not given support to this ship. Firstly, a ship must fly a flag. Mrs Dienesch suggested the idea of a neutral vessel. This concept does not exist in maritime law, the provisions of which have been laboriously worked out over the centuries. These provisions contain some most valuable clauses. For example, persons picked up on the high seas, in international waters, have the right of asylum in the country whose flag the vessel flies. It would be very dangerous to undermine this right. Where could a neutral vessel offer asylum in these circumstances?

Secondly, when such a vessel is on operations — and once again I pay tribute to the 'Cap Anamur' — it frequently has to sail near the limits of territorial waters, and I shudder to think of the complications if a European ship became involved in an international dispute in that situation. I therefore do not think it possible for a Community ship or a ship flying a Community flag to operate near the limits of Vietnamese territorial waters, attractive though the idea may be in some ways.

On the other hand, if Parliament so wishes, and that is the implication of the resolution before us, we should of course be quite prepared to give support to 'Ein Schiff für Vietnam' for the 'Cap Anamur', just as we have backed other non-governmental organizations.

As regards the root problem in Vietnam, Mr President, the news is not good. It is true that food supplies have been delivered, the transit camps have been organized for a long time, in fact, Mrs von Alemann, for a year and a half. Our governments have approved entry quotas to enable refugees to find a permanent home in our countries. At the Geneva conference 260 000 entries had been proposed for our countries, the largest quota being offered by Community Member States, although the USA also made a very substantial effort. Since then 27 000 additional places

have been offered. As of a few days ago 50 000 offers remained which had not yet been taken up. As regards arrangements for the Vietnamese, and the boat people in particular, reception conditions have been improved and a major effort is being made above all in France, where a large number of refugees have found a home, but also in the Federal Republic of Germany, the United Kingdom and in the other countries of the Community.

One might therefore think that the orderly departures envisaged in Geneva are going ahead well. Unfortunately I have to report that negotiations between the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and the Hanoi government have not been concluded satisfactorily. In May 11 216 departures from Vietnam were recorded. Only three hundred of these were covered by the agreement reached between the UN High Commissioner for Refugees and the Hanoi government! In other words, the agreement is having no effect and the Vietnamese continue to leave in the atrocious circumstances which have been condemned time after time in this House and elsewhere.

As a result, we again have floods of refugees. After falling to 4 000 per month, the number has just risen to over 11 000, as I mentioned a moment ago. In the transit camps we again have a very high number of refugees from Vietnam and elsewhere in South-East Asia: 228 000! So much for Vietnam.

As far as the unfortunate Kampuchians are concerned, I have on several occasions reported to this Assembly on what has been done. The conditions, I would remind you, differ in each of the three regions in question: Thailand, where the camps are organized under the supervision of the High Commissioner for Refugees with the aid of numerous non-governmental organizations, including the Red Cross, the frontier region, and lastly, Kampuchea itself. As you know, the Community has done a great deal. During the initial phase it contributed 31 million units of account. In the second phase, which began in April, we wanted to contribute 40 million units of account. Unfortunately the Council cut this amount down to only 20 million units of account. I note that when Parliament adopted the 1980 budget it did not see fit to increase this sum, despite requests to that effect from both ourselves and the Committee on Development and Cooperation. May I take the liberty this morning, as I did last night, of admitting that I am not always able to follow the logic of decisions taken by Parliament on budgetary matters.

Nevertheless, we are persevering with our work in the second phase through the intermediary of non-governmental organizations and the United Nations. In Kampuchea we operate exclusively through these bodies in the belief that if we were to show our national colours we would risk getting embroiled in political arguments with the Vietnamese authorities — the Phnom Penh government on the one

## Cheysson

hand and what remains of the Pol Pot authorities on the other — something that we want to avoid at all costs.

Mr President, the resolutions tabled on this subject cover a number of specific points. There is to begin with a very long reference to the fate of the children.

I wish to defend the attitude adopted by the High Commissioner for Refugees, which seems to me to be sound. The High Commissioner does not want hasty decisions to be taken on children who have lost contact with their families for certain periods. Just think of the potential tragedies if these children are immediately evacuated from the regions where they were found and taken far away from the area where their parents are most likely to be. And then, what can they do but wander across the world in search of an adoption which may often be difficult. That is why — and I respect this decision of the High Commissioner for Refugees — the children are kept in the area where they were found until one can be certain that their family has disappeared without trace. I do not think that we ought to encroach on the responsibilities of the Office of the High Commissioner in this regard, or obstruct it in its work.

The situation on the frontier has become exceptionally serious following the events which are all too familiar to you. I am glad that the two resolutions, especially the second, make reference to it. It was in fact on 22 June that a major military operation was launched by the Vietnamese troops, who had been viewing with growing alarm the emergence of a rather strange mixture of military and civilian elements in the camps. The hostilities lasted six days. The number of casualties is not known. All we know is that the wounded picked up by the Red Cross and now being treated in hospital number 450, which suggests that the casualties must have totalled several thousand.

The indirect consequences of the operation were no less serious. The hospitals and dispensaries in the region were pillaged, as were the camps near the frontier. All flights to Phnom Penh were suspended by the Thai authorities and have not yet been resumed. Another loss was the opportunity that 500 000 to 600 000 Kampuchean had used of coming to the frontier camps for food supplies, which they then brought back to their families by ox cart. At the time of these sad events 80 % of the refugees in the frontier region — and I would remind you that there were close on 150 000 of them — fled in great confusion towards Thailand, and have now returned to the frontier region, where they live in conditions of appalling distress, insecurity and primitive sanitary conditions. This very week, talks were held between the International Committee of the Red Cross, UNICEF, the World Food Programme and the Thai Government to work out some reasonable arrangement for the resettlement of the refugees from these camps, which had been destroyed and abandoned. Unfortunately the

conditions proposed were not acceptable to the Thai Government — the camps are of course situated in Thai territory — leaving the Red Cross and UNICEF with the problem of how to resume food distribution and medical treatment. The situation on the frontier is thus extremely grave. In other words, in the time which has elapsed since my report to you in April the situation in the camps in Thailand has not changed for the better. It has shown a slight improvement in Kampuchea itself, where, as I told you on that occasion, distribution was proceeding under conditions less difficult than before and subject to more effective supervision. On the frontier, however, the position can only be described as disastrous.

What can we do? One of the resolutions puts forward the proposal, a misguided one if you will forgive me for saying so, that the United Nations should be brought in to a neutral zone on the frontier. No such decision has ever been taken and no such proposal has ever been made before. Now the reason why this has not been proposed before is that the UN has not recognized the government in Phnom Penh and it is of course impossible to establish a neutral zone covering part of Kampuchea's territory, even a very small part, without talking about it to the *de facto* authorities. I personally have grave reservations about the idea of another UN conference. I do not see what it could achieve as regards a neutral zone on Kampuchean territory, since the United Nations has not recognized the Heng Samrin government, just as not one of the governments of the Member States has done. We therefore cannot have official talks with the representatives of Kampuchea either at national or at UN level.

If we want to make progress, there then we must continue to act first and foremost through the humanitarian organizations — and I should like to join many previous speakers in paying tribute to them once again. At the same time, we must bring political pressure to bear. And in that connection may I, on behalf of the Commission, endorse wholeheartedly what several speakers had to say on the need for political cooperation to see how, by indirect means, through governments that have relations with the *de facto* authorities, we can induce these authorities to adopt a more reasonable attitude. We have made a start along that road with regard to the distribution of food in Kampuchea, perhaps we can now make progress in the frontier region.

But above all I am a firm believer in the effectiveness of public indignation. I am convinced, Mr President, that we should never have been able to get into Kampuchea and launch the work at present in progress if this Parliament and other parliaments, backed by public opinion the world over, had not made it plain to the Vietnamese authorities and the present *de facto* authorities in Kampuchea that the world cannot allow human beings to be treated the way they are being treated in that region at this moment.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motions for resolutions will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

# 11. *Human rights in Argentina*

**President.** — The next item is the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Klepsch and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and by Mr Glinne and others on behalf of the Socialist Group on the serious violations of human rights and international law by the Argentinian military régime (Doc. 1-318/80).

I call Mr Penders.

**Mr Penders.** — (NL) Mr President, the motion for a resolution tabled by Mr Klepsch and others and Mr Glinne and others follows on from many other resolutions concerning the violation of human rights throughout the world, and especially Latin America. It also follows on from the hearings that Parliament and its political groups have held on Argentina. It is discouraging to find that there is apparently no end to the violation of human rights; but we must let such resolutions loose on the world each time, if only because the resolutions adopted by the European Parliament obviously have some impact. We hope that this resolution will also do something to help the four people concerned, if they are still alive — and there is unfortunately some doubt about that as well — and that it can still do something to save their lives.

Secondly, I should like to say that I am very pleased to see that we have had the cooperation of the largest group in this Parliament, something which, I feel, happens all too infrequently.

It would seem that a new phase has begun in the violation of human rights, one characterized by disappearances and abductions for which the régime in power disclaims all blame and responsibility, whereas it is in fact unofficially known that the murders and abductions take place with the knowledge, if not the approval, of the government. It is almost becoming the new fashion to have disappearances organized by the 'death squadrons' and other organizations, while the régime disclaims any official responsibility. We cannot, of course, put up with this: we must resist it.

To conclude, I should like to draw your attention to a very important point in this resolution, namely paragraph 8, which refers to proposals by Mr Granelli, a former Member of the European Parliament, that there should be a permanent Community information centre to enable us to react very quickly when people disappear and human rights are violated.

I need hardly say that I am confident that this motion for a resolution will find very broad support in this Parliament.

**President.** — I call Mr Glinne.

**Mr Glinne.** — (F) Mr President, we all know that next January in Bogota, Colombia, will be held the fifth Conference between the European Parliament and the Latin American Parliament. Our group believes it very important to begin already at this time a kind of review of the political situation in the various countries of Latin America since, whilst Chile may be the most glaring example, it is, alas, not the only country in that part of the world to evoke horror and indignation.

The resolution before us concerns specifically Argentina. Paragraph 3 condemns the criminal ideology of 'national security'. The motion for a resolution, which is based on precise and very recent information, denounces the collusion among police and armed forces and the cooperation between the forces of repression, particularly in Argentina and Peru. This condemnation is both relevant and timely, as is also the denunciation of the repeated attempts by the Argentinian secret services to intimidate exiles in Western Europe.

The conclusions are especially important. It is proposed that a critical study be undertaken of economic and trade relations between the EEC and Argentina. It is proposed that, within the framework of political cooperation, the Nine should seek to obtain the release of all political detainees and prisoners and secure respect for the right of the families of the missing exiles to be informed and to be protected against paramilitary and parapolic terrorism. That is necessary. We also endorse paragraph 8, the importance of which has just been underlined by Mr Penders. It revives the proposals made some time ago by Mr Granelli for the setting up of a permanent joint information centre to provide for urgent action where human rights are violated, so as to ensure coordination with various bodies such as the Inter-American Human Rights Commission, the UN and our own efforts within the Political Affairs Committee of the European Parliament to protect human rights.

It is for these reasons, Mr President, that the Socialist Group is solidly behind this motion for a resolution.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

If the resolution is adopted, I shall see to it that it reaches its destination as soon as possible.

12. *Importation of fresh lemons*

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-285/80) tabled by Mr Giummarra, on behalf of the Committee of External Economic Relations, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-34/80) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 471/76 as regards the period of suspension of the application of the condition on prices governing the importation into the Community of fresh lemons originating in certain Mediterranean countries.

I call Mr Del Duca.

**Mr Del Duca, deputy rapporteur.** — (I) Mr President, speaking on behalf of the rapporteur, Mr Giummarra, I have to tell you first of all that the Committee on External Economic Relations had decided to apply the procedure laid down in Rule 27A of the Rules of Procedure to the Commission's proposal for a regulation amending Regulation No 471/76, considering it to be purely technical in nature. However, at the request of the Committee on Budgets, our committee has prepared a brief explanatory statement on the Commission's proposal which it submits to Parliament, though not without certain reservations.

The proposed measure relates to concessions applying to imports into the Community of fresh lemons originating in certain Mediterranean countries, in this case Cyprus, Spain, Israel, Morocco, Egypt, Tunisia, Turkey and also occasional indirect imports from Jordan and Lebanon. Specifically, the Commission is proposing to extend until 31 May 1981 the suspension of the application of the conventional price to imports of fresh lemons, taking into account the fact that during the applications of the conventional price system exporting countries do try to respect the conventional price in order to avoid having to pay import duties.

The proposal is thus of a technical nature, ensuing from the agreements signed between the countries I have mentioned and the Community. Since the proposal has a negligible effect on revenue from customs duties, the Committee on External Economic Relations finds itself in favour of the proposal as such.

On the other hand, as regards the 1981 deadline and in recognition of the considerable concern expressed in this Parliament over the possible effect on the market in lemons originating in the Community, essentially that means Sicily, the committee wishes to draw the Commission's attention to the new situation which may be created by the Community's enlargement as regards the production and marketing of lemons.

**President.** — I call Mr Cheysson.

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (F) Mr President, I shall be very brief. As the rapporteur said, this is a technical matter. The system currently in force has worked well. Although I quite agree that we do need to consider the possible consequences of enlargement, for the time being at least the measures adopted are proving entirely satisfactory. For this reason the Commission hopes that Parliament will adopt the rapporteur's proposal.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

13. *Conservation and management of fish stocks*

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-304/80) by Mr Gautier, on behalf of the Committee of Agriculture, on

- the proposals from the Commission to the Council for
  - I a regulation allocating catch quotas among the Member States for vessels fishing in the waters of the Faroe Islands;
  - II a regulation allocating catch quotas among the Member States for vessels fishing in the waters of Sweden; and
  - III a regulation allocating catch quotas among the Member States for vessels fishing in the Norwegian exclusive economic zone (Doc. 1-232/80; and
  - IV a regulation laying down for the year 1980 certain measures for the conservation and management of fishery resources off the West Greenland coast applicable to vessels flying the flag of a Member State (Doc. 1-272/80).

I call Mr Gautier.

**Mr Gautier, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, I can keep my presentation brief, because the Committee on Agriculture adopted this report unanimously.

We are again dealing with the problem of the allocation of catch quotas available to the Community in the waters of third countries. The report is divided into four parts. It concerns the catch quotas allocated to the Community as a whole in negotiations with Norway. We of the Committee on Agriculture have again expressed our doubts about the procedure chosen by the Commission, because we often find it impossible to compare catch quotas allocated to third countries in Community waters with catch quotas allocated to the European Community in the waters of those third countries, and we again had this problem with Norway. The consultation procedure in this field

**Gautier**

must be improved, because it is unacceptable that quotas for stocks the Community shares with Norway should be allocated in May, while the quotas in Norwegian waters to which we are entitled are allocated in July. It then becomes impossible for us to tell which system the Commission has adopted.

We have no objections to the internal allocation of the Norwegian catch quotas to the Member States of the European Community; but as regards the allocation of the catch quotas for Swedish and Faroese waters, we of the Committee on Agriculture can only reject the Commission's proposal: where Sweden is concerned, because the fish stocks in Swedish waters are of interest only to the German and Danish fishing industry and the two countries have agreed between them on the sharing of catches and have informed the Commission accordingly. Nor can we of the committee understand why the Commission should depart from the proposal of the only countries directly involved, and depart quite substantially. For example, we have the Commission not agreeing to the allocation to one of these two countries of 85 tonnes of herring, which is a not inconsiderable catch, even though the two countries had agreed on this quantity.

Where the Faroe Islands are concerned, we cannot agree to the Commission's proposal, and for a very simple reason. If the Community had a common fisheries policy, under which all the fish stocks available to the Community were allocated on the basis of fixed criteria, then the criteria could be agreed upon; but as we do not have this, and all we do is share out catch quotas for third-country waters, the Community has always proceeded from the idea that newly-allocated quotas should be shared on the basis of historical reference catches by the various Member States. We see in the Commission's proposal a violation of this principle and therefore reject it.

We have no objections to the technical measures relating to preservation and the surveillance of catch quotas in Greenland waters.

**President.** — I call Mr Cheysson.

**Mr Cheysson, Member of the Commission.** — (F) Mr President, the Commission is fully aware of the importance of this subject. As the rapporteur quite correctly points out, these agreements concerning the waters of third countries are vital for the fishing industry.

The comments, which the rapporteur summarized just now, relate to three of the four regulations.

Let us take Norway first. The rapporteur rightly emphasized the considerable reduction in the quotas to be allocated to the Community in Norwegian waters in 1980.

This reduction is due to a substantial deterioration in the state of the most important stocks in that region. The seriousness of the deterioration may be gauged from the catch authorizations fixed for these stocks. The figure for cod has fallen from 850 000 tonnes in 1979 to 520 000 tonnes in 1980, and for haddock from 150 000 to 78 000 tonnes.

It is not just Community fishermen who are suffering but Norwegians as well. It is, however, impossible to draw a simple comparison between the reduction borne by the Community in its share of these stocks and the rather less substantial reduction in the quotas allocated by the Community to Norway. It is in fact necessary to take into account not just the quotas mentioned by Mr Gautier in his report, which relate to exclusive stocks, but also the joint stock quotas. The Community has obtained for 1980 transfers amounting to some 35 000 tonnes of the Norwegian share of these joint stocks.

Secondly, we need to bear in mind a provision contained in the outline fishing agreement between the Community and Norway, under which the present imbalance is to be phased out. By accepting this provision the Community agreed that the advantage it enjoys will be progressively reduced until it is eliminated altogether in 1983.

For the moment, if we look at all the catch quotas shared between the Community and Norway, the Community has an advantage of the order of 12 000 tonnes expressed in cod equivalent.

Let us pass on now to the regulation on Sweden. An amendment proposes that the Commission be asked to explain its attitude, and the rapporteur has just pointed out that there is an arrangement between Germany and Denmark. Mr President, it is a fundamental principle that the Community cannot be bound by an arrangement between two Member States. Departure from that principle would render any Community fisheries policy meaningless. I would furthermore point out that the Commission had no knowledge of the arrangement in question until after its own proposal had been worked out. However, after studying the arrangement between Denmark and Germany, the Commission is prepared, since the differences are very minor and having regard also to the views of this Parliament, to accept the allocation provided for in the arrangement.

We come then to the Faroe Islands. The allocation proposed follows the same lines as in previous years, with the exception of saithe and blue whiting.

Let us take saithe first. In 1979, only 4 115 tonnes were caught out of a quota of 13 500. The Community therefore had to restrict its request for saithe to a realistic level.

### Cheysson

As regards blue whiting, the Commission proposes an *ad hoc* allocation, with a quota at the 1979 level for the two Member States which actually fished for this species last year and a reserve of 3 000 tonnes for three other Member States.

Finally, Mr President, I should like to say something about the concern voiced both in committee and again during today's debate as regards the circumstances in which Parliament can follow the negotiations or consultations held regularly with third countries on fisheries.

It is incorrect to say, as does paragraph 8 of the motion for a resolution, that Parliament had not been able to make a comparison between present and past quotas. On the contrary, when the Commission proposals were under study Parliament was perfectly able to make such a comparison since the Commission had submitted to it the approved report of the conclusions of the fisheries consultations together with all relevant details. Obviously, all the facts concerning catch reserves, the Community's overall needs, stock conservation requirements and the like must in future be made available to Parliament.

But does that mean that we have to talk first about a negotiating mandate? I would point out that in the fisheries sector there is in fact no negotiating mandate but merely annual consultations which lead to arrangements.

And in any case, Mr President, it is not feasible as a rule for a negotiating mandate — which must remain as confidential as possible — to be the subject of public debate.

Likewise how can we conceive of an agreement, once reached, being modified after submission to the parliamentary authority?

On the other hand, let me repeat that Parliament must be given all the information it needs to assess the results of negotiations. Furthermore, constant contact must be maintained with the appropriate committees both before and during negotiations so that Members are kept abreast of developments.

**President.** — I call Miss Quin to speak on behalf of the Socialist Group.

**Miss Quin.** — On behalf of the Socialist Group, I should like to give warm support to the report by my colleague Mr Gautier. Once more with regard to fishing matters we seem, despite what the Commissioner has said, to be in the position of locking the stable door after the horse has bolted. I feel that Parliament's view on this subject is really of very little relevance, given the fact that these negotiations virtually cannot be changed by us. This leads me to feel that there is

frequently a very worrying lack of accountability with regard to fishing issues and particularly on negotiations with third countries.

I think, too, that the way that the reports are referred to us by the Commission makes it very difficult for us to treat them effectively. The reports on these various negotiations with third countries arrive in isolation from each other, and it is extremely difficult for us to make the necessary connection between the different agreements that have been worked out. The Commissioner has this morning said that we have to see these figures in the light of other figures and other negotiations, but when the document was presented to us these connections were not made at all clear. In fact, I often think that the fictional detectives, Hercule Poirot or perhaps Inspector Maigret, would be very welcome members of the Working Party on Fisheries or the Committee on Agriculture, because the difficulties we have in fathoming what exactly is happening are very great indeed.

Once again, on this particular fishing negotiation there seems to be absolutely no evidence of even rudimentary consultation with fishermen, yet many fishermen and fishing communities are severely affected by these proposals. I think, too, that the effects on different parts of the fishing fleets of different countries are not at all highlighted by the proposals. Moreover, a detailed analysis of the economic and social effects is lacking. Many members of the Working Party on Fisheries are worried by the way the Commission conducts its business as far as fishing matters are concerned. I think that many of these agreements, conducted as they are in a piecemeal manner, none the less set quite dangerous precedents and often seem to be part of some underlying policy to which neither the European Parliament nor national parliaments have given any kind of political sanction. This is, I feel, a very severe criticism of the way these negotiations are carried out.

So, in conclusion, I would like to say that the report by Mr Gautier points out the very serious deficiencies that exist where procedures for these fishing negotiations are concerned, and for this reason I hope the report will be given every support in this Assembly.

**President.** — I call Mr Battersby to speak on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

**Mr Battersby.** — Mr President, I would like to express our approval of Mr Gautier's report and to congratulate him on an excellent piece of work.

In the next few months, the Council, the Member States and the Commission will be preparing and deciding the common fisheries policy. But there is one piece missing out of the jigsaw, and that is the Parliament. In the preparation of the common fisheries

**Battersby**

policy, this Parliament also intends to be involved. Over the past year, as I and many other colleagues have pointed out, many decisions have been taken by Council and Commission on fisheries matters of vital concern to this Parliament without consulting or informing us. Parliament has been treated as a formality; as an automatic rubber stamp. I must disagree with Mr Cheysson on principle that we should only be consulted *ex post facto*. This is not the purpose of this Parliament. This may have been the case in the past, but we have shown, by instituting the Working Party on Fisheries, by holding meetings of this group every month, by the almost 100 % attendance at all meetings, by the questions, by the range and depth of the subjects we have discussed, that the fisheries working party, and this Parliament, intends to play its full part in the preparation of the common fisheries policy.

We in this Parliament represent the people — we do not represent the bureaucrats — we represent the fishermen and the processors and the consumer, and I ask Mr Cheysson if he would be so kind as to ask Mr Gundelach to make sure that we in the fisheries working party and in the Committee on Agriculture receive the working documents as soon as they are produced, in order to enable us to examine them and prepare our reports and opinions for presentation to this House in due time.

There is another point I would like to touch on here, and that is the involvement of members of the Committee on Agriculture or of this Parliament as observers at certain points in negotiations. I know this is a difficult matter, but I do ask the Commission and the Council to consider ways and means by which we, as a Parliament, can be represented at these international negotiations.

There are strong rumours in the trade at the moment that certain interests are negotiating with Canada for charter contracts to fish in Canadian waters with the intention of exporting large quantities of block-frozen cod to Europe. This, of course, might circumvent the tariff restrictions which we have recently brought in. I hope these are only rumours, but I do ask the Commission to let the Committee on Agriculture and the fisheries working party know as soon as possible whether there is any substance in these reports. The fisheries working party is ready at any time and in any place to meet the Commission to discuss fisheries matters, and once again I would emphasize that we are determined to play our full part in the run-up to the common fisheries policy.

**President.** — I call Mr Nyborg to speak on behalf of the Group of European Progressive Democrats.

**Mr Nyborg.** — (DK) Mr President, my Group endorses the report before us, in which the Commission's proposals for catch quotas in Faroese, Swedish and

Norwegian waters are rejected and the proposal laying down measures for the conservation of fishery resources off the West Greenland coast are approved.

It appears that Parliament and the Commission do not see eye to eye on this fisheries issue. In my view, it is essential for us to be consulted on Commission proposals before they enter into force, and we should most certainly be consulted on the outcome of negotiations with third countries before such negotiations are concluded, for otherwise the whole procedure becomes irrelevant and a mere sham. As Mr Battersby pointed out, we are Members of a directly elected Parliament and we represent the fishermen. We are therefore fully entitled to a hearing on this vitally important issue.

In negotiations with third countries on the allocation of catch quotas, we should as a general rule apply the principle of reciprocity. In the present instance, it appears that this principle has not been upheld and that the Community will suffer as a result. It is quite unacceptable, especially in the difficult circumstances in which fishermen have to work today, that the fishing industry should see its livelihood cut back even further. The time has now come for the introduction of a common fisheries policy to apply in Community waters — a policy that has been promised to us, for when agreement was reached on the United Kingdom's future contributions it was announced that now we could also hope to arrive at a fisheries policy acceptable to all the Member States. Let us have that policy now. Let us have it before the three new applicant countries join the Community, before the problem becomes even more intractable.

In conclusion, I would say that in our view quota arrangements and unnecessary bureaucracy should in general be avoided in the fisheries sector. At any event, the Commission should not put all its trust in the pessimistic forecasts of certain marine biologists as to fish-stocks in Community waters: attention should also be given to those biologists who take a more optimistic view of the stocks.

**President.** — I call Mr Kirk.

**Mr Kirk.** — (DK) Mr President, I fully endorse the report before us and what the previous speakers have said. It seems to me that what we are talking about is not so much the report itself or the Commission's proposal as the manner in which the Commission has sought to secure Parliament's cooperation. I can only say that, during the twelve months that I have worked together with my honourable colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture, whenever we have sought to establish a dialogue with the Commission on the problem of fisheries we have been given the cold shoulder. We have so far had no genuine negotiations with the Commission on the substance of fisheries

Kirk

problems, and all the speakers so far have made the same point. And so I think we should use the opportunity provided by Mr Gautier's report to say to the Commission — especially in the present situation, where proposals for a common fisheries policy are being worked out for consideration by the Council on 21 July — that we are ready to cooperate constructively towards the establishment of a common fisheries policy and, that being so, we want to be consulted before the Council of Ministers has taken its decisions. We do not want to act as a mere clearing-house for the Commission after the Council has decided on specific proposals. — For that is what is happening now, what has been happening over the past year. I therefore call on the Commission in the strongest possible terms to make use of the expertise available in this Parliament and to endeavour to arrive at a good result in cooperation with the Committee on Agriculture. I think it disgraceful that, whereas we have an excellent dialogue with the Commission in our committee on agricultural matters, as soon as we start talking about fisheries it is as if we were talking to a brick wall.

I want to take Mr Cheysson up on what he said about a small section of the agreement with Sweden. Denmark and Germany arrived at a mutually satisfactory arrangement on the allocation of catches, but now Mr Cheysson comes along and tells this House that for reasons of principle it is impossible to approve an agreement between two Member States and that it is the Commission that must decide. It is clearly the Commission that decides, but it is also the bureaucrats in Brussels who decide and who will not accept a sensible solution agreed to by two Member States. Since no other Member State is involved, I really think that the Commission has no alternative but to go along with that solution.

Another point is the line taken by the Commission within the Baltic Sea Fishery Commission. Although this is not a matter specifically connected with the proposal in hand, it is a fact that none of the other countries which belong to the Baltic Sea Fishery Commission includes catches within the base lines in its annual catches. This approach has, however, been rejected by the European Commission in the case of Germany and Denmark. I find this highly unsatisfactory and call on the Commission to change its mind on this question and ensure that we are placed on the same footing as the other countries that belong to the Baltic Sea Fishery Commission.

**President.** — I call Mr Provan.

**Mr Provan.** — Mr President, first of all I would like to congratulate Mr Gautier on his report. However, the equanimity with which it has been received in the House this morning rather surprises me, because every Member who has spoken so far has castigated the

Commission for the way it has treated not only the fisheries working party but the Committee on Agriculture and Parliament itself by concluding this arrangement with Norway without consulting the House. Mr President, we have over 100 examples of this kind of behaviour at the moment. We have referred it to the Legal Affairs Committee, and I hope the Legal Affairs Committee will do something about it very quickly and bring forward a strong report that will make the Commission quake in its shoes, as I am sure a report from my colleague, Mr Prout, normally does.

It is absolutely and totally ridiculous that we should have reached the stage where our Parliament is being treated in such a way. However, it is not only Parliament that is being treated in this way. I represent an area of North-East Scotland, and a large number of my constituents depend on fishing for their livelihood. Yet in this report we read of a reduction of one-third in the cod catch. Mr Cheysson likes to speak of a cod equivalent. In fact, cod equivalent has got nothing to do with it as far as my fishermen are concerned. What we are interested in is getting fish for human consumption, and it is only that that really matters as far as we are concerned.

It is ridiculous, Mr President — and I point this out to the Commission — that we should be in the position of negotiating with Norway a reduction of one-third in our cod catch, while we have not imposed any sanction on Norway by reducing its catch from our Community waters. This is something that will have to be looked at by the democratically elected Parliament, because we can stand it no longer.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting time.

#### 14. *Statistical surveys of areas under vines*

**President.** — The next item is the report (Doc. 1-302/80) by Mr Colleselli, on behalf of the Committee of Agriculture, on

the proposal from the Commission to the Council (Doc. 1-133/80) for a regulation amending Regulation (EEC) No 357/79 on statistical surveys of areas under vines.

I call Mr Colleselli.

**Mr Colleselli, rapporteur.** — (I) Mr President, I wish to say a few words about the motion for a resolution recently adopted by the Committee on Agriculture concerning Regulation (EEC) No 357/79 on statistical surveys of areas under vines. The resolution endorses a Commission proposal to amend this regulation so as to extend the time limit by which Italy must



## Colleselli

carry out the first basic survey. The legal obligations imposed by the regulation remain unaffected, however, the two main obligations being to carry out basic surveys every ten years, the first of which should have been submitted in March 1980, and to provide certain essential information annually. Now, the Commission originally proposed extending the deadline by one year.

Later, when it was found that one year was not enough, the committee saw no objection to extending the deadline to 1982. Investigations, my own included, confirmed that the Italian Government's main and quite real difficulties sprang from the failure of the Italian Parliament to pass the general legislation on statistical surveys — the draft was actually tabled back in February and has been passed by the Senate and we believe it will also be passed very soon by the lower House — and so the Commission agreed to put forward a compromise proposal that took into consideration these difficulties and also Italy's commitment in spite of them to provide all the necessary data annually and making 31 December 1981 the time limit for carrying out the first basic survey of areas under vines in Italy. As I say, this is a compromise proposal that the Committee on Agriculture is prepared to accept.

Finally, I come to paragraph 3 of the resolution, which calls on the Italian Government to consider the possibility of carrying out the survey using techniques similar to those already planned for the register of olive cultivation, namely aerial photography, remote surveys and data processing so as to improve the quality of the results and enable them to be completed within the specified time limit.

In submitting this resolution adopted by the Committee on Agriculture for Parliament's consideration I should point out that Italy is fully aware of the need to adhere to this time-limit without fail so that all the data essential for a wine-growing policy can be available — but that is something that will shortly be coming up for debate both in committee and in this House.

**President.** — I call Mr Brunner.

**Mr Brunner, Member of the Commission.** — (D) Mr President, we should like to thank Mr Colleselli for his report. We think this is a satisfactory solution. The Italian Government has made considerable efforts. Our thanks to it, too. We shall be able to complete our work by the date stipulated in the motion for a resolution. I feel we are making good progress here.

**President.** — The debate is closed. The motion for a resolution will be put to the vote at the next voting-time.

## 15. Votes

**President.** — The next item comprises the votes on those motions for resolutions on which the debate is closed.

We begin with the *Peters report (Doc. 1-215/80): Restructuring of the steel industry.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraph 1)

On paragraph 2, I have Amendment No 12, tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and rewording this paragraph as follows:

2. Expresses its regret that the existing Community instruments for an active employment policy cannot be satisfactorily deployed, as there is too little money in the relevant funds and the Council's position on this point has not been made sufficiently clear.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) This text does not correspond to the committee's decision, but it does take the matter further in that it makes an additional, positive comment. I propose that it be incorporated in the resolution as an addition to paragraph 2.

**President.** — Mr Klepsch, do you accept this point of view?

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) Yes, Mr President.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 12 and then paragraph 2, thus amended)

On paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 20, tabled by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group and rewording this paragraph as follows:

3. Regrets the absence of a coherent Community industrial policy and notes that the rapid restructuring taking place in the steel industry throughout the Community is causing considerable loss of jobs in other industries as well as in iron and steel.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) I propose that this amendment be rejected. The committee also rejected it.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 20 and adopted in succession paragraphs 3 and 4)

**President.** — On paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mrs Salisch on behalf of the Socialist

**President**

Group and replacing this paragraph with the following new text:

5. Regards the rapid dismantling of entire industries and the total abandonment of broad areas of the iron-and-steel regions
  - as socially indefensible for reasons already stated,
  - as economically indefensible in that it would reduce the capacity and structure of the industries below a level required for future needs and would destroy and disperse the skilled and traditional work-force that exists at present;

Fails to comprehend the attitude of some Member States in forgoing Community aid which would alleviate problems in regions of the Community that are becoming devastated and ought to be receiving preferential consideration and support, and regrets that in the current situation some Member States are reducing the level of regional aid;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) This amendment was also discussed by the committee, which rejected it.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted in succession paragraph 5 and paragraphs 6 and 7)*

**President.** — On paragraph 8, I have Amendment No 21, tabled by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group and deleting the word 'perfectly'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) The amendment does not change the text. It merely deletes one word. I am in favour.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 21 and then paragraph 8, thus amended)*

**President.** — On Paragraph 9, I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 22, tabled by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group and rewording this paragraph as follows:

9. Stresses that, in addition to the creation of new jobs, which is necessary for social and economic reasons, full use should continue to be made of Article 56 (2) (b),

— Amendment No 32, tabled by Mrs Dekker and rewording this paragraph as follows:

9. Stresses that in addition to the creation of new jobs, which is necessary for social and economic reasons, priority must be given to maintaining employment in existing sectors of industry as far as possible and that therefore full use should continue to be made of Article 56 (2) (b), while noting that these measures are far from adequate.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) I propose that these two amendments be rejected. They change the text substantially and are also, in content, incorrect in some respects.

*(Parliament rejected both amendments and adopted paragraph 9)*

**President.** — On paragraph 10, I have three amendments:

— Amendment No 23, tabled by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group and rewording this paragraph as follows:

10. Welcomes the Commission's proposals to help finance early retirement, but doubts the economic feasibility or advisability of some of the Commission's other proposals;

— Amendment No 2, tabled by Mrs Salisch on behalf of the Socialist Group and replacing this paragraph with the following text:

10. Approves the measures proposed by the Commission in those provisions in which it goes beyond the usual ECSC measures, covering the following four fields:
  - (a) early retirement
  - (b) restrictions on overtime
  - (c) improvements in conditions and duration of work
  - (d) changes to shift-work;

— Amendment No 13/ rev., tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and deleting the word 'unreservedly' in the opening line.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) Amendment No 2, by Mrs Salisch, and Amendment No 13/rev., by Mr Klepsch, both call for the deletion of the word 'unreservedly'. As this does nothing to change the content, I am in favour of these two amendments. As Amendment No 23 largely rejects the content, I am against it.

*(Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 23 and 2 and adopted in succession Amendment No 13/rev. and paragraph 10, thus amended)*

**President.** — After paragraph 10, I have Amendment No 35, tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and inserting the following new paragraph:

- 10a. Emphasizes that the proposed measures must have a favourable impact on employment opportunities

**President**

without harming company competitiveness, the restoration or, as appropriate, improvement of which is essential in order to maintain as many jobs as possible.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) This amendment was not discussed by the committee — understandably, because it had not yet been tabled. It corresponds to wording used in the Commission's proposal for a decision and therefore simply confirms it to some extent. I am therefore in favour.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 35)*

**President.** — On paragraph 11, I have two amendments:

- Amendment No 24, tabled by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group and deleting this paragraph; and
- Amendment No 3, tabled by Mrs Salisch on behalf of the Socialist Group and adding the following at the end of this paragraph:

11. ...; concludes that some of the benefits presently included under the Commission's proposals may need to be increased if they are to be effective.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) Amendment No 24 must be rejected, because it seeks to delete the paragraph. Amendment No 3 was submitted to the committee and was rejected by it: what it calls for is already done in practice.

*(Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 24 and 3 and adopted in succession paragraphs 11 and 12)*

**President.** — On paragraph 13, I have two amendments:

- Amendment No 25, tabled by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group and deleting everything after the words 'structural and temporary overtime'; and
- Amendment No 14, tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and rewording this paragraph as follows:

13. Advocates the elimination of systematic overtime by means of a uniform Community regulation which must at the same time provide for increases in the lowest salaries and recommends the Commission to investigate to what extent these measures may be monitored or controlled via the systems for registering or approving overtime which are required in most countries of the Community.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend the rejection of Amendment No 25, which seeks to delete part of the first clause and all of the second, which contains important references. I also recommend the rejection of Amendment No 14, which seeks to delete the first three lines, despite what was decided in committee.

*(Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 25 and 14 and adopted paragraph 13)*

**President.** — On paragraph 14, I have Amendment No 4, tabled by Mrs Salisch on behalf of the Socialist Group and replacing this paragraph with the following new text:

14. Proposes that workers' allowances in respect of improvements in conditions and duration of work should be granted.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) The committee discussed this amendment and rejected it.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 4 and adopted paragraph 14)*

**President.** — On paragraph 15, I have Amendment No 5/rev., tabled by Mrs Salisch on behalf of the Socialist Group and adding the following sentence at the beginning of this paragraph:

15. Asks both sides of industry to take a resolute action towards the reduction of the working week at least to 35 hours and ...

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) The amendment was discussed by the committee and was rejected.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 5/rev.)*

**President.** — On paragraph 15, a further five amendments have been tabled:

- Amendment No 15, tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD), which is now withdrawn;

- Amendment No 10, tabled by Mr Herman and Mr Beumer and rewording this paragraph as follows:

15. Recommends that both sides of industry negotiate an adjustment in working-hours, where possible through the more intensive use of equipment; assum-

## President

ing that average output remains at its present level, this might speed up the annual trend towards shorter working-hours, resulting in at least as much work being done by more people and thus reducing unemployment;

— Amendment No 26, tabled by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group and replacing this paragraph with the following text:

15. Recognizes the social desirability of achieving a reduction in working-hours and the responsibility of the social partners in each Member State to negotiate accordingly.

— Amendment No 33, tabled by Mrs Dekker and rewording this paragraph as follows:

15. Recommends that both sides of industry negotiate significant reductions in the amount of work done by each worker; this reduction should amount to at least 10 % of total working-time, without loss of salary, over a period of 5 years, and the resulting costs can be covered by an improvement in productivity and contributions from employers and employees and, if necessary, from governments.

— Amendment No 6, tabled by Mr Michel and rewording this paragraph as follows:

15. Calls on both sides of industry to negotiate significant reductions in the amount of work done by each worker; this reduction should amount to at least 10 % of total working-time, without loss of salary, over a period of 5 years, the underlying concern being to achieve harmonization of working-hours at the European level during this period.

These amendments are mutually exclusive.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) All these amendments seek to make substantial changes to the text adopted in committee. I therefore recommend that all four amendments be rejected.

*(Parliament rejected in succession all four amendments and paragraph 15)*

**President.** — On paragraph 16, I have three amendments:

— Amendment No 27, tabled by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group and deleting this paragraph;

— Amendment No 34, tabled by Mrs Dekker and rewording this paragraph as follows:

16. Calls for new patterns of shift-work, principally by the introduction of an extra shift, preferably for heavy and irregular work.

— Amendment No 16, tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's

Party (CD) and rewording this paragraph as follows:

16. Calls for new patterns of shift-work, principally by regulations providing for extra rest-shifts for older workers and those with particularly arduous jobs.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) All three amendments would make either deletions or substantial changes, and I therefore recommend the House to reject them.

*(Parliament rejected Amendments Nos 27 and 34 and adopted Amendment No 16)*

**President.** — On paragraph 17, I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 17, tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and amending this paragraph as follows:

... and demands that vocational training, retraining and further training programmes, as well as worker mobility, should receive more Community assistance.

— Amendment No 7, tabled by Mr Michel and amending this paragraph as follows:

17. Expresses its concern at the fact that, in addition to older workers, young people are affected by restructuring or fail to find alternative training places or opportunities for rehabilitation in single-industry areas, and demands that vocational training and retraining measures in such areas should receive more Community assistance.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) Amendment No 7, by Mr Michel, seeks to make a logical addition to the present text by inserting the reference to rehabilitation, which is already mentioned later in this paragraph.

Amendment No 17, by Mr Klepsch, seeks to add further elements. The third element, 'and further training programmes, as well as worker mobility', is also in conformity with the decision.

I therefore recommend the adoption of both amendments.

*(Parliament adopted amendments Nos 17 and 7 and then paragraph 17, thus amended)*

**President.** — After paragraph 17, I have Amendment No 8, tabled by Mr Michel and adding the following new paragraph:

**President**

- 17a. Calls on both the governments of the Member States and the Commission to do their utmost to ensure that industrial redevelopment is carried out in the areas affected by the restructuring of the steel industry and to this end requests the Commission to lay before the Council without delay a plan of action as part of a European industrial policy.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr. Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) This amendment was not available to the committee; but as it amplifies the programme previously called for, I recommend its adoption.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 8 and then paragraphs 18 to 20)*

**President.** — On paragraph 21, I have two amendments deleting this paragraph:

- Amendment No 18, tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD); and
- Amendment No 28, tabled by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend that both be rejected.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 18, as a result of which Amendment No 28 fell)*

**President.** — On paragraph 22, I have 3 amendments:

- Amendment No 19, tabled by Mr Klepsch on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and deleting this paragraph;
- Amendment No 29, tabled by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group and also deleting this paragraph; and
- Amendment No 9, tabled by Mr Michel and amending this paragraph as follows:

22. Welcomes the positive attitude of the major European trade-union associations to the Commission's draft decision, although the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment considers that there is scope for improvement of the latter in future; therefore calls on employers and unions in the iron-and-steel industry in the Member States, with the participation of governments as necessary, to discuss how the proposed measures could be applied in their particular circumstances and to spell this out in their subsequent negotiations in order to ensure progressive harmonization at the European level.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) Amendments Nos 19 and 29 seek to delete the whole of the paragraph: I therefore recommend that they be rejected. Amendment No 9 seeks to make a logical addition to the existing text. Although it was not discussed in committee, I recommend its adoption.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 19, as a result of which the other two fell)*

**President.** — On paragraph 23, I have two amendments:

- Amendment No 30/rev., tabled by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group and replacing this paragraph with the following new paragraphs:

- 23. Strongly condemns the negative attitude of the Council;
- 23a. Still supports the Commission proposal that 100 m EUA be entered in the general budget and proposes that, in view of the urgency of the matter, 60 m EUA should be made available in 1981 and 40 m EUA in 1982.

- Amendment No 11, tabled by Mrs Salisch on behalf of the Socialist Group and replacing this paragraph with the following text:

- 23. Supports the Commission's proposal<sup>1</sup> to transfer appropriations from the General Budget of the Communities to the ECSC Budget in order to fund the special time-restricted measures in question and point out that the sum spent on these social measures over the 3-year period should not be lower than 100 m EUA.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) Amendment No 30/rev., by Mr Spencer, consists of two parts and comes closest to what the committee in fact wants. I therefore recommend the adoption of this amendment. Amendment No 11 would then fall.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 30/rev., as a result of which Amendment No 11 fell)*

**President.** — On paragraph 24, I have Amendment No 31, tabled by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group and deleting this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) I am against.

*(Parliament successively rejected Amendment No 31 and adopted paragraphs 24 and 25)*

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 118, 13. 5. 1980, p. 6.

**President.** — I can now give the floor for explanations of vote.

I call Sir Peter Vanneck.

**Sir Peter Vanneck.** — I should like, in the three minutes that the Socialist Group has given me,

*(Laughter)*

to explain to the House why I shall be voting for Mr Peter's report, with all its background detail that so cogently supports the motion.

Of course the Commission proposal is inadequate in the really desperate situation of the steel industry — worldwide, here in Europe, in the United Kingdom and in my own constituency — but it is something tangible, and, with all that was said yesterday, no doubt it can be augmented when we have more money.

I particularly welcome the emphasis on retraining. As an engineer who has run a drop-forge and press shop, I know the quality of the personnel concerned. They are working red-hot, if not molten, metal, and they are noted not only for their skill but also for their courage. They must be given all possible help in turning to lighter industrial work, the service industries and so on. In my constituency of Cleveland, we have at Redcar, thanks to Community funds, one of the largest and most efficient blast furnaces in Europe; but its very efficiency necessarily results in an aggravation of the unemployment problem in the area.

So I shall be voting for this resolution, in the knowledge that this Parliament will in this way have made known its appreciation of the gravity of the situation and its determination to do its best to rectify it.

Consett is not the only disaster area — Teeside has suffered longer and more profoundly — but I urge the whole House to vote with me on this motion for the sake of the whole of Europe.

**President.** — I call Mrs Clwyd.

**Mrs Clwyd.** — Mr President, it was made only too harshly clear here yesterday by the speeches of many of my colleagues that the problems arising from the crisis in the steel industry are considerably aggravated by the fact that practically all the areas hit by huge losses of jobs are located in regions which are almost totally dependent on that one single industry. For this reason, aids for restructuring must go hand-in-hand with massive aids to the regions concerned in an attempt to create new jobs, as the Peters report so rightly stresses.

The social problems arising from such developments will be particularly acute in areas such as South Wales. About 52 000 people are likely to lose their jobs, taking the unemployment rate to over 15 %. The question which the European Parliament, the Commission and the Council should be asking themselves is whether this is the sort of future they want for the people and the industry of Europe. Is the European Community prepared to stand back while its basic industries are decimated, or will it earn the respect of the people of Europe by producing positive proposals to halt the downward spiral which many European administrations now seem to have embarked upon?

While I and my colleagues will vote for the Peters report, we are particularly concerned about some of the amendments which have been made in the past half hour, particularly the deletion of paragraphs 15 and 22.

I give notice here to the European Community that it must recognize and make special allowance for the relatively poor state of the United Kingdom economy. In France and West Germany, attempts to restructure areas hit by the coal and steel run-down have taken place in the context of a strongly growing national economy. That is not the case in the UK, where there is expected to be a fall in output and where the government accepts and, indeed by its policies, contrives to produce increasing inflation and rising unemployment. *(Cries from the European Democrats.)* Mr Vredeling has over the last few months criticized the UK Government for its callous disregard of workers and their families. One of the Christian-Democrat members of our Committee on Social Affairs and Employment has described the attitudes of the employers in Britain: she said they talked about workers as though they were stale sandwiches to be thrown in a wastepaper bin.

The Parliament should today demonstrate that it, at least, has some compassion and concern for people who, through no fault of their own, are losing their jobs. We must today press the Council for action, too long delayed and urgently needed. I urge you all to vote for the Peters report.

**President.** — I call Mr Martin.

**Mr Martin.** — *(F)* Mr President, the double talk and demagogical posturing in this Parliament is reaching previously unscaled heights.

The French Communists and their allies wish to reaffirm their total opposition to the restructuring plans, particularly insofar as they affect the iron and steel industry. We have fought these plans all along. Today we note, firstly, that no one in this Assembly has disowned them in the course of this debate. Nevertheless, they must be stopped at once. That is what the workers demand, and we are firmly behind them.

**Martin**

Secondly, no one here can talk any longer about these plans with confidence or pride now that we and the workers have exposed them for what they are: plans to run down the afflicted regions.

We must call a halt to these measures right now. It is all too easy for you today to shed bitter tears over a disaster you have provoked yourselves and actively helped to bring about. The social measures proposed may perhaps have the merit of salving your consciences but they will never make good all the evil you, from the right wing through to the Socialist Group, have always accepted.

We shall not of course reject the few subsidies you propose for the workers since you cannot do otherwise in the face of their discontent. We shall therefore abstain on the Peters report, putting on record plainly: first, that it is for the governments of the Member States to take the essential social measures; second, that the big bosses, particularly in France, are today calling in question established social rights and that they are doing so with the connivance of these governments; third, that this Assembly utters pious hopes and engages in hollow debate on derisory amounts. Know then that the big bosses, the French Government and the Brussels Commission will always be confronted by solid resistance from resolute Communists and their allies.

Lastly, may I say to Mr Oehler, who was weeping crocodile tears yesterday, how utterly repugnant are these on-the-spot visits by wreckers of the steel industry coming to observe the disastrous consequences of a policy implemented by the steel bosses and approved by themselves.

**President.** — I call Mr Van Minnen.

**Mr Van Minnen.** — (NL) Mr President, yesterday we at least still had a reasonable motion for a resolution, which admittedly could have been improved; but today there is not much sense left in it after all the perverse changes that have been made. Above all, the references to a reduction in working-hours have been deleted. I am therefore in half a mind to vote against, but at the same time there is still too much in the resolution for it to be rejected as a whole. I must admit, even though some may laugh, that it is causing me a considerable conflict of conscience, but there is too much left to vote against and so to leave the workers who place their hopes in this out in the cold even longer. Despite my reluctance, I shall therefore vote in favour.

**President.** — I call Mr Peters.

**Mr Peters, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, we now have before us a final version of

the motion for a resolution which measures up neither to the ideas of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment nor to the rapporteur's ideas. I would like to pick out just three points.

Firstly, paragraph 21. The hearing organized by the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment established that the employers in the steel industry rejected without qualification all provisions other than early retirement. Yesterday Mr Calvez said that this could not be correct, as in the end the employers in the Consultative Committee voted in favour, with three German votes against. At the hearing, however, they made it absolutely clear that the German position was that of the European Steel Industry Employers' Organization. We wished to express our regret at such an attitude, and it is unfortunate that the decision went against this.

Secondly, there is the attitude of the trade unions, which is covered in paragraph 22: these are unions which in widely differing countries have different structures, which are under great pressure but which nevertheless have arrived at a constructive attitude in support of the Commission's proposals. It is lamentable that this aspect is no longer in the resolution. I find it deplorable that we should have discussed and voted on aid for steel workers and all employees, which is a very important part of industrial policy, and that virtually none of the Communist benches was occupied, even though they allegedly defend the welfare of the workers.

At this point I must also make some comment — incidentally my first — on Mr Oehler's expressions of regret yesterday. When I wanted to make an on-the-spot study of pressures on steel workers and the structure of industry in individual countries, particularly in Lorraine, the Communists prevented me from talking to the steel workers. I was not there to present or defend the Davignon plan — it is not my plan, it is not the way I go about things, and I do not consider it an advisable course of action; I was there as a trade unionist to talk to other trade unionists, and to prevent me from doing so is not to pursue a policy in support of labour.

*(Applause from the left)*

However, the most regrettable result is in the matter of working hours. May I state that in the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment the members of the European People's Party, insofar as they were present, voted for this paragraph. They also voted for the other two paragraphs, and have now adopted a different position here in Parliament. That is very unfortunate, as reduced working hours must be an important element in this Community's employment policy and the social aspects of its industrial policy.

*(Applause from the left)*

**Peters**

However, the resolution does represent a considerable aid for the steel industry and the people it employs, and we should therefore vote for it.

*(Applause from various quarters)*

**President.** — I call Mr Nordlohne.

**Mr Nordlohne.** — (D) Mr President, in yesterday's debate we stated very clearly that if most of our amendments were adopted this morning we should be able to vote for Mr Peters motion for a resolution. Unfortunately, I note that our amendment No 10 to replace paragraph 15 was not adopted. This is regrettable for everyone, as paragraph 15 would then have read:

Recommends that both sides of industry negotiate an adjustment in working-hours, where possible through the more intensive use of equipment; assuming that average output remains at its present level, this might speed up the annual trend towards shorter working-hours, resulting in at least as much work being done by more people and thus reducing unemployment.

We would have welcomed such an amendment to the motion for a resolution.

We must bear this in mind. May I say that, in all, we are pleased that the majority of our amendments have been taken up, and we wish to thank those who voted for them. On behalf of the EPP Group I can say, without recommencing yesterday's debate, that we shall vote in favour of the Peters report in its present form, as it contains the main amendments we tabled, particularly the deletion of paragraphs 21 and 22.

**President.** — I call Mr Oehler.

**Mr Oehler.** — (F) Mr President, I am always astonished by all the hot air I listen to in this Chamber: What a lot of it! But when it comes down to it, it is difficult to take a serious decision.

The Peters report has been totally dismembered by the right wing in this Assembly. We are not even left with so much as a leg in plaster. Today we have not even adopted the minimum represented by paragraph 15, which called for a reduction of working-hours within five years. We shall therefore vote against the report, for we do not want to be regarded as accomplices, like the French Communists, who are going to abstain.

*(Laughter)*

**President.** — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman.** — Mr President, as one who sat here throughout every minute of the steel debate

yesterday but unfortunately was unable to be called, I would like to tell Parliament precisely why I am voting for the report. I am particularly interested in paragraph 12, which extends the proposed age-limit of 55 for early retirement to all workers in the European iron-and-steel industry on a voluntary basis and to extend it particularly to workers with more arduous jobs, and I think the words 'voluntary basis' are extremely important in a democracy. I should also like to express very strong support for paragraph 17, which seeks to extend training facilities particularly to the young and to those in single-industry areas such as my own area of Workington. I think it is very important that the Council takes this very seriously and, in conjunction with the Hoff resolution, does in fact transfer the funds which will be essential to do the job that this report set out to do.

**President.** — I call Mr Calvez.

**Mr Calvez.** — (F) Mr President, the members of the Liberal and Democratic Group have never been indifferent to the situation of the workers employed in the steel sector. It was with them in mind that we were particularly critical yesterday of some of the paragraphs in the report by Mr Peters, to whom we nevertheless wish to pay tribute for the work he has done.

We are realists and we are aware of our responsibilities. We note that our views have found a hearing. The amendments adopted by our Assembly render the text acceptable to us, and we shall be voting in favour of the motion.

**President.** — I call Mr Balfe.

**Mr Balfe.** — May I, in my capacity as resident pedant, point out that the word 'decimated' means reduced by one-tenth and not to one-tenth. It has now been used three times wrongly here in these explanations of vote.

*(Laughter)*

**President.** — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution as a whole.

The resolution is adopted. <sup>1</sup>

\*

\* \*

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 197 of 4. 8. 1980.



**President.** — We now proceed to the *Hoff* report (Doc. 1-266/80): *Contributions to the ECSC from the General Budget*.

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraph 1)

On paragraph 2, I have two amendments:

- Amendment No 5, tabled by Mr Bonde and others and deleting this paragraph; and
- Amendment No 3, tabled by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group and replacing the word 'Welcomes' with 'Notes'.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Hoff, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend rejection of Mr Bonde's amendment, as he is implying that this motion for a resolution exceeds Parliament's powers.

Mr Spencer's amendment should also be rejected, as it represents a compromise.

(Parliament rejected both amendments and adopted paragraph 2)

**President.** — On paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 6, tabled by Mr Bonde and others and deleting this paragraph.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Hoff, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend rejection.

(Parliament rejected the amendment and adopted paragraph 3)

**President.** — On paragraphs 4 and 5, five amendments have been tabled:

- Amendment No 7, tabled by Mr Bonde and others and deleting paragraph 4;
- Amendment No 8, tabled by Mr Bonde and others and deleting paragraph 5;
- Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Peters on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and replacing paragraph 4 by the following text:
  4. Consequently approves the proposal for a decision.
- Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Peters on behalf of the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment and rewording paragraph 5 as follows:
  5. Strongly urges the Council to take a decision as soon as possible to grant the special temporary financial contribution<sup>1</sup> and to adopt the present decision and thus avoid wasting any more precious time on disputes, which would be inopportune and of second-

dary importance given the aims of the social measures to be adopted and would be interpreted by the workers concerned as a pretext for not giving practical expression to the much-vaunted Community solidarity just when it was most urgently needed;

- Amendment No 4, tabled by Mr Spencer on behalf of the European Democratic Group and replacing paragraphs 4 and 5 by the following single paragraph:

4. Strongly supports and desires the availability of resources for these purposes and supports the budgetary transfer envisaged to the ECSC, but recognizes the difficulties that may exist concerning the required legal basis and urges the joint budgetary authority to overcome such legal difficulties as may stand in the way of the resolution of the problem.

Amendments Nos 1 and 2 have subsequently been withdrawn.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Hoff, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend adoption of Mr Spencer's amendment and rejection of Mr Bonde's amendments.

(Parliament rejected the three amendments, then rejected paragraphs 4 and 5 by sitting and standing)

**President.** — I call Mrs Hoff.

**Mrs Hoff, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, with the rejection of paragraphs 4 and 5 the content and the aim of this motion for a resolution have also been rejected. It now really has no substance, and I would recommend rejection. It is no longer possible to vote for it. I do not know what else could be done: Perhaps it could be sent back to the committee if this were possible under the Rules of Procedure ...

(Cries of: 'No, impossible'.)

Then, Mr President, I wish to withdraw the entire motion for a resolution.

**President.** — At this stage in the proceedings, Mrs Hoff, that is no longer possible. All we can do now is to reject it or adopt it.

**Mrs Hoff, rapporteur.** — (D) Which rule states that this is not possible?

<sup>1</sup> COM (79) 436 final.

**President.** — Mrs Hoff, under Rule 26 (3), a motion can no longer be withdrawn once the voting has begun.

After paragraph 5 I have Amendment No 9, tabled by Mr Bonde and others and adding the following two new paragraphs:

6. Considers that in presenting this motion the Assembly is exceeding its authority, because the motion in effect invites the Commission to make payments without the necessary legal authority.
7. Requests, therefore, the President of the Assembly to file the report.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mrs Hoff, rapporteur.** — (D) I recommend rejection.

*(Parliament rejected the amendment)*

**President.** — I call Mr Lange.

**Mr Lange.** — (D) Mr President, I must state categorically that I consider it quite impossible for a vote to be taken on something which no longer expresses Parliament's opinion. If it is considered that, for procedural reasons, a vote can still be taken, then one can vote against it, as the content is now meaningless. However, as the Rules of Procedure say nothing specific about it, we should just drop the matter. It does not express Parliament's opinion. If we are to continue voting, I myself can only vote against it.

**President.** — I call Mr Bangemann.

**Mr Bangemann.** — (D) Mr President, each Member is free to vote against the resolution if he considers that, after adoption or rejection of amendments, the text means nothing to him personally, or that it is nonsense, or that it does not express his political views. Everyone is free to vote against it. However, our decision (and we have acted accordingly) is that something which is being put to the vote can no longer be sent back to committee, nor can it be withdrawn. We are now voting, and if you consider it to be nonsense then you reject it, and if the majority reject it then it no longer exists. This is really quite standard procedure.

**President.** — Mr Bangemann, the problem is that the opinion on the proposal is now devoid of content. It is therefore legitimate to ask whether it is still an opinion.

Nevertheless, I see no other solution than that of putting to the vote the whole text as we now have it.

I call Mr Arndt.

**Mr Arndt.** — (D) Mr President, a precedent was set on Wednesday. We had a motion for a resolution where we had adopted numerous recitals but both proposals were then rejected. That was on the Rules of Procedure. Thereupon the President did not call for a final vote.

The case is exactly the same here, Mr Bangemann. If the actual proposal is rejected by the House, then there can no longer be a final vote, as, apart from the recitals, there are no proposals. I therefore wonder whether, as on Wednesday, we should not abandon the vote the committee's actual proposal has fallen — possibly because we first voted on the amendment which departed furthest from the text and then on the less radical ones. The Committee on Budgets will then have to put forward a new proposal if it wants a proposal at all.

*(Cries)*

**President.** — The situation is a simple one. If the text as it now is rejected, it goes back to the committee, which consequently has to submit a new report on the Commission's proposal, which is what is really at issue. This seems to me the best procedure.

I call Mr Klepsch.

**Mr Klepsch.** — (D) I do not say this very willingly, as I have always been very satisfied with the way you have conducted the proceedings. However, the whole problem arose because you put paragraphs 4 and 5 together to the vote. If you had taken a separate vote on paragraph 4, we should have retained a major part of the content. However, we had to vote as we did because our amendment for the deletion of paragraph 5 was rejected. We would certainly have voted for paragraph 4. Nothing can be altered now: I am saying this simply to explain my group's voting conduct.

**President.** — I would remind Mr Klepsch of what I have just said. If he now votes against what is left of the text, the document will go back to the committee. I therefore repeat that the course I have indicated is in my view by far the most appropriate for getting us out of this situation.

I call Mr Seal.

**Mr Seal.** — Mr President, I am afraid that you must bear some of the responsibility for this vote, because when we voted by a show of hands the result was so close that your officers recommended a vote by sitting and standing. It may be that some people in this Chamber are incapable of standing up, but certainly

**Seal**

some of the people who voted by raising their hands did not stand up. Now, I feel, Mr President, and I have raised this point with you in the Chair before, that we have a very expensive electronic voting equipment here. I feel that if a show of hands produces a close result, you should use the electronic system. Then no one can dispute the result.

**President.** — Mr Seal, the result was perfectly clear.

I call Mr Balfe.

**Mr Balfe.** — Can I suggest, Mr President, that one way out would be for ten Members to request a quorum. Since one is not present, that would effectively dispose of the matter. I am willing to request that a quorum be called.

*(Mixed reactions)*

**President.** — Mr Balfe, I think that is not a good solution, for the very simple reason that at the first sitting in September you will see the problem again in exactly the same terms as it is now. So if you want to solve the problem you have to reject the motion for a resolution.

I call Mr Spencer.

**Mr Spencer.** — Can I just make the point that my group did warn the House yesterday that if they did not accept the amendments put forward in the name of the European Democratic Group, exactly this kind of situation would arise. That was why Mr Tugendhat recommended the House to follow this particular course. Because of the way in which the vote took place, that has not in fact happened. I do believe that the substance of the report, when taken together with the Peters report, reflects Parliament's views. Therefore we shall continue to vote for it at this stage and not delay the matter further by referring it back to committee. It is my belief that this has been a largely theoretical, indeed theological, debate and that in fact the solution which the Commission will ultimately propose — although it would be wrong of me to identify it at this stage — will not in fact involve any of these problems concerning the legal basis. So I suggest that we get on with it, vote for this report however apparently illogical it is in terms of its grammar, and at least push the Council to give this aid to steel workers at the first possible opportunity.

**President.** — I call Mrs Kellett-Bowman.

**Mrs Kellett-Bowman.** — I strongly support the words that have just been uttered by my colleague, Mr Spencer. Had this Parliament seen fit to adopt his amend-

ment No 4, which strongly supports and desires the availability of resources for these purposes and supports the budgetary transfer envisaged to the ECSC, and urges the joint budgetary authority to overcome such legal difficulties as may stand in the way of the resolution of the problem, we should not be in the situation we are in now. Nevertheless, I concur in his opinion that it is absolutely essential that we do say here and now that the difficulties currently being experienced by the Community's coal and steel industry must be alleviated by a Community programme on the restructuring of these branches of industry.

For these reasons I shall in fact support the report, as I did the Peters report.

**President.** — I call Mr Provan.

**Mr Provan.** — I rise on a point of order to obtain clarification of a ruling that I understood you to have given. You said that if Parliament rejected this report it would be sent back to committee. Now my understanding is that if Parliament rejects a report it falls, and that is the end of the matter.

**President.** — Mr Provan, if the report falls the consultation between the committee and the Commission still takes place.

I call Mr Bonde.

**Mr Bonde.** — (DK) The members of the People's Movement did not vote against the granting of funds to finance ECSC projects. What we did was to express our opposition to the illegal measures advocated by the rapporteur, Mrs Hoff. The ECSC Treaty lays down in perfectly clear terms how ECSC projects may be financed. This is done with the aid of production levies, and provision is made for the acceptance of gifts by companies. But there is no provision in the EEC Treaty that would allow gifts to be made to the ECSC; there is no provision that would make such a transfer of funds possible. Even if in the case in question the provisions could be interpreted in such a way as to make it possible, we have in my country a constitution which prevents such a transfer of new fiscal revenue unless it be approved either by referendum or by a five-sixths majority of the Danish Parliament. Those are the rules in my country and we will not budge on them. This explains why we voted against the call for illegal measures — that is how we see it — contained in Mrs Hoff's report.

**President.** — I call Mrs Hoff.

**Mrs Hoff, rapporteur.** — (D) Mr President, may I emphatically reject Mr Bonde's last remark?

**President.** — I call Mr Calvez.

**Mr Calvez.** — (F) Mr President, we are unanimous in wanting to help the steel workers, and in the French edition of the Diary covering yesterday's debates, I read: 'In her report, Mrs Hoff took the view that the entry in the EEC budget of a contribution to the ECSC was enough to allow this expenditure to be implemented. The Commission does not share this view, believing, like Mr Calvez, that a legal basis must first be established and that a Council decision will therefore be needed.'

To help the workers, we need to vote for the resolution right now, precisely in order to create this legal basis which is at present lacking.

**President.** — I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

\*

\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *von Wogau report (Doc. 1-236/80): Industrial products from third countries.*

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We proceed to the *von Wogau report (Doc. 1-141/80): Motor vehicles, certain construction plant, textile names, electrical equipment and biodegradability.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 and 2)

On paragraph 3, I have two amendments tabled by Mr Moreland:

— Amendment No 1, deleting the phrase 'to rear-view mirrors (Doc. 1-703/79); and

— Amendment No 2, adding the following new paragraph:

3a. Approves the Commission's proposal relating to rear-view mirrors subject to the amendment that 3-wheeled saloon cars (with standard car steering-wheels) should not be required to instal two exterior

mirrors fitted on either side of the vehicle but should be required to fit one internal and one offside external rear-view mirror.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr von Wogau, rapporteur.** — (D) These amendments are technical improvements and I recommend adoption.

(Parliament adopted in succession Amendment No 1, paragraph 3 in its amended form and Amendment No 2)

**President.** — On paragraph 4, an Amendment No 3, deleting this paragraph, was tabled by Mr de Ferranti and others, but it has subsequently been withdrawn.

(Parliament adopted paragraph 4)

I put the amended motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We now proceed to the *de Ferranti report (Doc. 1-224/80): Powered industrial trucks.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 3)

On paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Delorozoy and deleting subparagraph (b).

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Lady Elles, deputy rapporteur.** — I am against.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted in succession paragraph 4 and paragraphs 5 and 6)

**President.** — I put the motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

**President.** — We now proceed to the *Cottrell report (Doc. 1-267/80): Integration of railway undertakings.*

(Parliament adopted the preamble)

On paragraph 1, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Travaglini and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and rewording this paragraph as follows:

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 197 of 4. 8. 1980.

**President**

1. Approves the broad lines of the Commission report, except on the points set out below, and shares the view implicitly contained in it that at this stage conditions are still not ripe for total integration of railway undertakings at Community level.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Cottrell, rapporteur.** — I have no objection to this text.

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 1 and then paragraph 2)*

**President.** — On paragraph 3, I have Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Travaglini and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and completing this paragraph as follows:

3. ... the railways, having full regard to Article 80 (2) of the EEC Treaty where it refers to regional policy, on which the Commission is requested to take appropriate measures;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Cottrell, rapporteur.** — It is a reasonable addition to the text. I accept it.

*(Parliament adopted in succession Amendment No 2, paragraph 3, thus amended, and the beginning of paragraph 4)*

**President.** — On paragraph 4 (i), I have Amendment No 3, tabled by Mr Travaglini and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and amending this subparagraph as follows:

- (i) establishing a medium- and long-term programme ... (rest unchanged).

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Cottrell, rapporteur.** — A perfectly reasonable addition, Mr President.

*(Parliament adopted in succession Amendment No 3, subparagraph (i), thus amended, then subparagraph (ii))*

**President.** — On paragraph 5, I have Amendment No 4, tabled by Mr Travaglini and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and amending the beginning of this paragraph as follows:

5. Requests the Commission to promote the coordination of:
  - (i) railway investment and finance within the European Community;
  - (ii) the technological advance of railway operations ... (rest unchanged).

I call Mr Janssen van Raay.

**Mr Janssen van Raay.** — (NL) Mr President, this amendment is withdrawn.

*(Parliament adopted in succession paragraph 5 and paragraphs 6 to 8)*

**President.** — On paragraph 9, I have Amendment No 5, tabled by Mr Travaglini and others on behalf of the Group of the European People's Party (CD) and completing this paragraph as follows:

9. ... overall common transport policy designed, among other things, to achieve the gradual integration of railway undertakings;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Cottrell, rapporteur.** — I accept this.

*(Parliament adopted in succession Amendment No 5, paragraph 9, thus amended, and paragraph 10)*

**President.** — I put the amended motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote. The resolution is adopted. <sup>1</sup>

\*

\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Buttafuoco report (Doc. 1-218/80): Transport infrastructure*.

The resolution is adopted. <sup>1</sup>

\*

\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Aigner report (Doc. 1-275/80): Implementation of the 1979 budget*.

The resolution is adopted. <sup>1</sup>

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We proceed to the *E. T. Kellett-Bowman interim report (Doc. 1-283/80): Budgetary control aspects of the Data-Processing Centre*.

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 197 of 4. 8. 1980.

**President**

I call Mr Kellett-Bowman.

**Mr Kellett-Bowman, rapporteur.** — Mr President, could I draw your attention to Rule 29 (1)? There is no doubt that four amendments to this report were properly tabled, but they were definitely not moved in the debate last night. If I draw your attention to Minute 16 of yesterday's proceedings, you will find that no amendments at all were moved, and Rule 29 (1) says Parliament shall not deliberate on any amendment unless it is moved during the debate.

**President.** — I call Mr Colla.

**Mr Colla.** — (NL) Mr President, during the debate one of the things Mr Notenboom said was that he would support Amendment No 2, by Mrs Lizin.

I am sorry, but it was discussed.

**President.** — I call Mr Kellett-Bowman.

**Mr Kellett-Bowman, rapporteur.** — Mr President, Mr Notenboom said he would be happy with that amendment unless I gave him an assurance, which I did in the debate, that the amendment was not moved. The minutes show that it was not moved.

**President.** — In conformity with the Rules of Procedure, these amendments will therefore not be put to the vote.

I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted. <sup>1</sup>

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We proceed to the *Marshall report (Doc. 1-289/80): Situation of refugees in the Horn of Africa.*

(Parliament adopted the first indent of the preamble)

After the first indent of the preamble, I have Amendment No 4, tabled by Mr Coppieters and Mrs Castellina and adding the following new indent:

- noting that the situation has been worsening rapidly in recent months and that not only refugees but the rest of the population of Somalia and neighbouring countries will be threatened with starvation in the coming months,

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Marshall, rapporteur.** — Despite its parentage, I am able to accept this amendment.

(Laughter)

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 4 and then the second and third indents)

**President.** — After the third indent, I have Amendment No 5, tabled by Mr Coppieters and Mrs Castellina and adding the following new indent:

- noting that, in addition to the threat of starvation and the dramatic shortage of water, there is also a real danger of epidemics of disease, in particular cholera,

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Marshall, rapporteur.** — This is also acceptable, Mr President.

(Parliament adopted Amendment No 5 by sitting and standing)

**President.** — On paragraph 1, I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 1, tabled by Mr Narducci and others and amending this paragraph as follows:

1. Calls for an increase in the Community's food-aid programme and for full implementation of the exceptional emergency aid measures provided for in Article 59 of the Convention of Lomé and Article 137 of the new Convention, in order to meet the increasing food needs of this region of Africa in the second quarter of 1980.

— Amendment No 6, tabled by Mr Coppieters and Mrs Castellina and completing this paragraph as follows:

1. ... and for emergency measures, including, if need be, a special airlift to ensure that the aid rapidly reaches those for whom it is intended.

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Marshall, rapporteur.** — As far as Amendment No 1 is concerned, Mr President, I am against it, because it refers to asking the Community to meet the food needs of this region of Africa in the second quarter of 1980. The original text talks about the final half of the year. As we are in the month of July, I think it is somewhat more pertinent to try to meet the needs of this region in the second half of the year than in the second quarter, which has come and gone.

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 197 of 4. 8. 1980.

**Marshall**

With regard to Amendment No 6, as Members heard in the very early minutes of this morning, this is what the Community has actually done and is willing to do. Therefore I think we should support it.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and adopted Amendment No 6)*

**President.** — After paragraph 1, I have two amendments:

— Amendment No 2, tabled by Mr Narducci and others and adding the following new paragraph:

- 1a. Insists on the need for the combined use of all available instruments of cooperation in order to provide a serious response to the alarming situation of the million-and-a-half refugees in Somalia who are threatened with famine and epidemics of the plague and cholera and are, in many cases, experiencing a situation of total deprivation which is unacceptable to the international conscience;

— Amendment No 7, tabled by Mr Coppieters and Mrs Castellina and adding the following new paragraph:

- 1a. Calls on the Commission and Council to take urgent steps to provide the financial and technical assistance needed to meet the specific problem of water supplies, in particular by the provision of shallow wells;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Marshall, rapporteur.** — I am in favour of both of them, Mr President.

*(Parliament adopted both amendments)*

**President.** — On paragraph 2, I have Amendment No 3, tabled by Mr Narducci and others and amending this paragraph as follows:

2. Welcomes the Community's increased aid to the UN High Commission for Refugees, and asks the Community to continue its close collaboration with this organization and to substantially strengthen its support for the non-governmental organizations which are implementing local aid projects vital to the survival of the most deprived sections of the population;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Marshall, rapporteur.** — Mr President, despite the presence of a split infinitive in the English translation of this amendment, I can support it.

*(Laughter)*

*(Parliament adopted Amendment No 3 and paragraph 3 in succession)*

**President.** — On paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 8, tabled by Mr Coppieters and Mrs Castellina and rewording this paragraph as follows:

4. Asks the European Commission to keep the Parliament informed on an on-going basis and to submit monthly reports on the Community's aid to countries in the Horn of Africa and on technical, administrative or political difficulties which may be encountered, thus enabling its Committee on Development and Cooperation to monitor this work;

What is the rapporteur's position?

**Mr Marshall, rapporteur.** — As the Commissioner explained at 00.05 this morning, this would involve a substantial amount of staff time, which would, in fact, reduce the amount of assistance going to the refugees. What the refugees need is action, not words, and therefore I would ask the House not to vote for this amendment, but rather to accept the original text.

*(Parliament rejected Amendment No 8 and adopted in succession paragraphs 4 and 5)*

**President.** — I put the amendment motion for a resolution as a whole to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

I call Mr Griffiths for an explanation of vote.

**Mr Griffiths.** — Mr President, all I wanted to say is that I fully support the report as it has gone through. However, at 00.10 this morning I felt that I had not received a satisfactory answer to the question I put to Mr Cheysson and because of the time he was not able to reply.

At least I was not able to put a further question of clarification to him. I want it put on the record that I shall be following up this point to get clarification about the speed at which we are able to deliver aid to those areas which need it so badly.

\*

\* \*

**President.** — We proceed to the Schieler et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-284/80): Aid to refugees in the South China Sea.

I call Lady Elles for an explanation of vote.

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 197 of 4. 8. 1980.

**Lady Elles.** — Mr President, I would like to explain why we shall abstain on this motion. We sympathize completely with the sentiments expressed and the difficulties that one particular Member State is undergoing with its humanitarian action in the South Seas, but in view of the explanation given by Mr Cheysson, who recognized the impracticability of the proposals in the operative paragraph of this resolution, we feel we have no option but to abstain.

**President.** — I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — We proceed to the *Israel et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-301/80/rev.): Aid to Kampuchea.*

(Parliament rejected the preamble and paragraphs 1 to 4)

After paragraph 4, I have Amendment No 1, tabled by Mrs Weiss and adding the following new paragraph:

- 4a Urges the European Community to introduce emergency humanitarian aid;

What is Mr Israel's position?

**Mr Israel.** — (F) I agree, Mr President.

(Parliament rejected Amendment No 1 and paragraph 5)

**President.** — The motion for a resolution is therefore rejected.

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the *Rinsche et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-312/80): Border incident between Vietnamese and Thai troops.*

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the *Seal et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-316/80): EEC-US relations in the steel sector.*

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

**President.** — We proceed to the *Klepsch et al. motion for a resolution (Doc. 1-318/80): Human rights in Argentina.*

I call Lady Elles for an explanation of vote.

**Lady Elles.** — Mr President, I should like to give an explanation of vote on behalf of the European Democratic Group. I have already raised objections this morning to the very late hour at which this motion for a resolution was put before this House. Even if we had wanted to support the contents of it, or even part of the contents, there was no time within the Rules of Procedure even to put down any amendments. I would ask through you, Mr President, that the chairmen of political groups should meet and decide that no requests for urgent procedure should be put down after a Thursday morning, because otherwise it is impossible for our group to make a proper contribution, which I believe is also true of the majority of Members, who want to make this House a body which is respected and not just a talking-shop.

**President.** — I will convey Lady Elles' request to the Bureau. I put the motion for a resolution to the vote.

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Giummarra report (Doc. 1-285/80): Importation of fresh lemons.*

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Gautier report (Doc. 1-304/80): Conservation and management of fish-stocks.*

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

\*  
\* \*

**President.** — I put to the vote the motion for a resolution contained in the *Colleselli report (Doc. 1-302/80): Statistical surveys of areas under vines.*

The resolution is adopted.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> OJ C 197 of 4. 8. 1980.



**President**

I call Lord O'Hagan.

**Lord O'Hagan.** — Mr President, I should like to take this opportunity to wish everybody a happy holiday in the summer and to thank all the staff, particularly the interpreters, for the way they look after us.

*(Applause)*

16. *Membership of committees*

**President.** — I have received from the European Democratic Group a request for the appointment of:

- Sir John Stewart-Clark to the Political Affairs Committee, to replace Mr Jakobsen;
- Mr Hord to the Committee on Agriculture, to replace Mr Howell;
- Mr Newton Dunn, to the Committee on Budgets to replace Lord O'Hagan;
- Mr Howell to the Committee on Budgets, to replace Mr Hord;
- Mr Beazley to the Committee on Economic and Monetary Affairs, to replace Sir Peter Vanneck;
- Mr Price to the Committee on Energy and Research, to replace Lord Douro;
- Mr Moreland to the Committee on Energy and Research, to replace Sir Peter Vanneck;
- Mr Spicer to the Committee on External Economic Relations, to replace Mr de Courcy Ling;
- Lord O'Hagan to the Committee on External Economic Relations, to replace Mr Kellett-Bowman;
- Mr Taylor to the Committee on Social Affairs and Employment, to replace Mr Spicer;
- Sir Peter Vanneck to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Protection, to replace Mr Newton Dunn;
- Mr Curry to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, to replace Sir David Nicolson;
- Mr Cottrell to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, to replace Mr Spicer;
- Mr Hutton to the Committee on Youth, Culture, Education, Information and Sport, to replace Mr Price;
- Mr Sherlock to the Committee on Development and Cooperation, to replace Mr Marshall;
- Mr Kellett-Bowman to the Committee on Development and Cooperation, to replace Mr Simmonds;
- Mr Patterson to the Committee on Budgetary Control, to replace Mr Taylor; and
- Mr de Courcy Ling to the Committee on the Rules of Procedure and Petitions, to replace Mr Tyrrell.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

17. *Membership of Parliament*

**President.** — I have been informed by the French authorities that with effect from today Mr Jean José

Clément is a Member of the European Parliament and has taken the place of Mr Claude Labbé.

I welcome the new Member and remind the House that, under Rule 3 (3) of the Rules of Procedure, a Member whose credentials have not yet been verified provisionally takes his seat in Parliament and on its committees with the same rights as other Members.

18. *ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly*

**President.** — You will find in the minutes of proceedings the list of Appointments of Members of the European Parliament to the ACP-EEC Consultative Assembly which have been submitted by the political groups, it being understood that one post remains to be filled.

Are there any objections?

These appointments are ratified.

19. *Dates of the next part-session*

**President.** — There are no other items on the agenda. I thank the representatives of both Council and Commission for their contributions to our work.

The enlarged Bureau proposes that our next sittings be held at Strasbourg during the week from 15 to 19 September 1980.

Are there any objections?

That is agreed.

20. *Approval of the minutes*

**President.** — Rule 17 (2) of the Rules of Procedure requires me to lay before Parliament, for its approval, the minutes of proceedings of this sitting, which were written during the debates.

Are there any comments?

The minutes of proceedings are approved.

21. *Adjournment of the session*

**President.** — I declare the session of the European Parliament adjourned.

The sitting is closed.  
*(The sitting was closed at 12.25 p.m.)*





## Price

	United Kingdom	Ireland	Belgium and Luxembourg	Denmark	Germany	France	Italy	Netherlands	Other countries
	UKL	IRL	BFR/LFR	DKR	DM	FF	LIT	HFL	BFR
Annual subscription 1980—1981	21.25	23.25	1 400,—	252,—	87,50	204,—	39 100	96,—	1 400,—
Single copies:									
up to 32 pages	0.60	0.70	40,—	7,20	2,50	5,80	1 120	2,80	40,—
up to 80 pages	1.20	1.40	80,—	14,40	5,—	11,60	2 240	5,60	80,—

more than 80 pages : price set accordingly in each case and shown on cover.

Prices do not include postage.

Debates of the European Parliament, published as an annex to the Official Journal of the European Communities, comprises :

- report of proceedings,
- annual indexes.

## Sales

Annual subscriptions run from March, the beginning of the Parliamentary Year, until February.

Orders may be placed with the Secretariat of the European Parliament or the Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

Payments to be made only to this Office.

### Secretariat of the European Parliament

Centre européen

Plateau du Kirchberg

Boîte postale 1601 — Luxembourg

### Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

Boîte postale 1003 — Luxembourg  
and 5, rue du Commerce — Luxembourg

Postal cheque account : 19 190-81

Bank current account : B.I.L. 8-109/6003/300

Price UKL 7 20 / IRL 8 40



OFFICE FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS  
OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

ISSN 0378-5041

Boîte postale 1003 — Luxembourg

Catalogue number: AX-AA-80-007-EN-C